Distance-Based Influence in Networks: Computation and Maximization

Edith Cohen
Tel Aviv University
Google Research
edith@cohenwang.com

Daniel Delling
Sunnyvale
USA
daniel.delling@gmail.com

Thomas Pajor
Cupertino
USA
thomas@tpajor.com

Renato F. Werneck
San Francisco
USA
rwerneck@acm.org

arXiv:1410.6976v4 [cs.SI] 31 Jan 2016

ABSTRACT

A premise at a heart of network analysis is that entities in a network derive utilities from their connections. The *influence* of a seed set S of nodes is defined as the sum over nodes u of the *utility* of S to u. *Distance-based* utility, which is a decreasing function of the distance from S to u, was explored in several successful research threads from social network analysis and economics: Network formation games [Bloch and Jackson 2007], Reachability-based influence [Richardson and Domingos 2002; Kempe et al. 2003]; "threshold" influence [Gomez-Rodriguez et al. 2011]; and *closeness centrality* [Bavelas 1948].

We formulate a model that unifies and extends this previous work and address the two fundamental computational problems in this domain: *Influence oracles* and *influence maximization* (IM). An oracle performs some preprocessing, after which influence queries for arbitrary seed sets can be efficiently computed. With IM, we seek a set of nodes of a given size with maximum influence. Since the IM problem is computationally hard, we instead seek a *greedy sequence* of nodes, with each prefix having influence that is at least $1-1/e$ of that of the optimal seed set of the same size. We present the first highly scalable algorithms for both problems, providing statistical guarantees on approximation quality and near-linear worst-case bounds on the computation. We perform an experimental evaluation which demonstrates the effectiveness of our designs on networks with hundreds of millions of edges.

1. INTRODUCTION

Structural notions of the *influence* of a set of entities in a network which are based on the *utility* an entity derives from its connectivity to others, are central to network analysis and were studied in the context of social and economic models [3, 4, 16, 25, 29, 31, 39, 42] with applications that include ranking, covering, clustering, and understanding diffusion and network formation games. More formally, influence is typically defined in terms of utilities u_{ij} between ordered pairs of entities. The influence of a single entity i, also known as its *centrality,* is the sum of utilities $\mathsf{Inf}(i) = \sum_j u_{ij}$ over entities j. The influence of a set S of entities is the sum over entities of the highest utility match from S:

$$\mathsf{Inf}(S) = \sum_j \max_{i \in S} u_{ij} \ .$$

One of the simplest and more popular definitions of influence relies on *reachability-based* utility [26, 31, 40]. The network here is a directed graph, where entities correspond to nodes. We have $u_{ij} = 1$ when the node j is reachable from node i. Therefore, the influence of S is the number of entities reachable from S. A powerful enhancement of this model is to allow for multiple *instances*, where each instance is a set of directed edges, or for a distribution over instances, and accordingly, define u_{ij} as the respective average or expectation. The popular Independent Cascade (IC) model of Kempe et al. [31] uses a distribution defined by a graph with independent inclusion probabilities for edges.

More expressive utility is based on shortest-path distances [3, 4, 16, 25, 31, 39, 42]. Specifically, the utility is $u_{ij} = \alpha(d_{ij})$, where $\alpha(d) \geq 0$ is a non-increasing function [4, 16, 20, 41] applied to the respective shortest-path distance. Reachability-based utility falls out as a special case, using $\alpha(x) = 1$ for finite x and $\alpha(+\infty) = 0$. Popular kernels include exponential decay $\alpha(x) = \exp(-\lambda x)$, polynomial decay $\alpha(x) = 1/\mathrm{poly}(x)$, Gaussian $\alpha(x) = \exp(-\lambda x^2)$, and threshold, which is obtained using $\alpha(x) = 1$ when $x \leq T$ and $\alpha(x) = 0$ otherwise. This variety, used in practice, demonstrates the value of this modeling flexibility.

A distance-based model for information diffusion in social networks was recently proposed by Gomez-Rodriguez et al. [27]. In their model, the seed set S corresponds to the "infected" nodes and edge lengths correspond to propagation time. The shortest paths distance from S to a node v corresponds to the elapsed time until v is "infected." The decay function models the amount by which slower propagaing is less valuable. Again, the modelling power is enhanced by working with multiple instances (each instance is a set of directed edges with lengths), or with a distribution over such instances, and defining the utility as the average of $\alpha(d_{ij})$ over instances or as the expectation $u_{ij} = \mathsf{E}[\alpha(d_{ij})]$. In particular, a natural model associates independent randomized edge lengths (REL) with live edges [1, 14, 23, 27], using exponential [1, 14, 27] or Weibull [23] distributions.

We provide an intuitive explanation to the power of randomization to improve the quality of reachability-based and distance-based utility measures. We expect the utility u_{ij} to be higher when there is a short path and also to when there are more paths. The deterministic shortest-path distance does not reflect paths multiplicity, but with REL, a pair connected by more paths will have a shorter expected distance than another pair, even when distances according to expected edge lengths are equal [14]. In addition, randomization, even as introduction of random noise, is a powerful tool in learning, as it reduces the sensitivity of the results to insignificant variations in the input and overfitting the data.

We note here that the work of Gomez-Rodriguez et al. and subsequent work on distance-based diffusion [23, 27] was focused specifically on threshold decay functions, where for a threshold parameter T, $u_{ij} = 1$ only when the distance is at most T. Distance-based utility with smooth decay functions, which we study here, naturally occur in the physical world and was extensively studied also in the context of data analysis [41] and networks [4, 16, 29, 39]. In particular, distance-based influence generalizes the distance-decaying variant [6, 12, 16, 21, 39] of closeness centrality [3], which was

studied with exponential, harmonic, threshold, and general decay functions.

The two fundamental algorithmic problems in applications of influence are *influence computation* and *influence maximization* (IM).

Influence computation is the problem of computing the influence of a specified seed set S of nodes. This can be done using multiple single-source shortest-paths computations from the seed set, but the computation does not scale well when there are many queries on very large networks. Cohen et al. for reachability-based influence [15] and Du et al. for threshold influence [23] designed *influence oracles* which preprocess the input so that influence queries $\mathsf{Inf}(\mathscr{G},S)$ for a specified seed set S can be approximated quickly. In both cases, a sketch, based on [11], is computed for each node so that the influence of a seed set S can be estimated from the sketches of the nodes in S. For general distance-based influence, we can consider an oracle designed for a pre-specified function α (say reachability-based or threshold), or a more powerful oracle which allows α to be specified at query time.

Influence maximization is the problem of finding a seed set $S \subset V$ with maximum influence, where $|S| = s$ is given. Since reachability-based and threshold influence [27, 31] are special cases, we know that distance-based influence maximization with general α is NP-complete and hard to approximate to anything better than $1-(1-1/s)^s$ of the optimum for a seed set of size s (the hardness result is asymptotic in s) [24]. Fortunately, from monotonicity and submodularity of these influence functions [27, 31], we obtain that the greedy algorithm (GREEDY), which iteratively adds to the seed set the node with maximum marginal influence, is guaranteed to provide a solution that is at least $1-(1-1/s)^s > 1-1/e$ of the optimum [37]. This (worst-case) guarantee holds for every prefix size of the sequence of seeds reported, which means that the GREEDY sequence approximates the Pareto front of the trade-off of seed set size versus its influence. The Pareto front provides added value since it characterizes the influence coverage of the network and can be used to find bi-criteria sweet spots between the size of the seed set and its coverage.

In terms of solution quality, also in practice, GREEDY had been the gold standard for submodular maximization. Scalability, however, remains an issue for reachability-based influence even with various optimizations [9, 34], and even when working with a single instance. As a result, extensive research work on reachability-based influence maximization proposes scalable heuristics [30], scalability with guarantees only for a small number of seeds [7, 46], and, more recently, SKIM, which computes a full approximate GREEDY sequence [15] while scaling nearly linearly with input size. For threshold influence, existing maximization algorithms are by Du et al. [23] based on sketches [11] and by [45] based on an extension of the reachability-based algorithm of [46]. These designs, when using near-linear computation, can only provide approximation guarantees for a small number of seeds, even when edge lengths are not randomized.[1]

[1]Note that SKIM, which is the design we build on here, provides strong worst-case statistical guarantees on both accuracy and running time, for producing a full approximate greedy sequence of seeds. The computation is proportional to the size of the instances and is near-linear when the number of instances is small. Other existing algorithms, even related ones also based on reverse searches [7, 11, 23, 46], do not compute a full sequence in near-linear time: The running time grows with the number of seeds even on a single instance, which is the same as an IC model with all probabilities being 0 or 1. The inherent issue is the quality of the approximate greedy solution. The performance of an approximate greedy algorithm on a sample deteriorates quickly with the number of seeds, so a very large sample size, $O(sn)$ in total, may be needed when we are interested in good approximation with respect to all seed sets of size s, which is needed in order to correctly identify the maximum one. The power and novelty of SKIM comes from efficiently maintaining a *residual problem*, which allows for samples which provide relative error guarantees on *marginal contributions* of new seed candidates. We also note that SKIM runs in worst-case near-linear time on inputs specified as a set of (arbitrary) instances. It is not known if near-linear time algorithms that compute an approximate greedy sequence exist for the IC model.

Contributions. Our contributions are as follows. Our distance-based influence model is presented in Section 2. We define exact and approximate GREEDY sequences and establish approximation guarantees of both. We then formulate a representation of a *residual problem* with respect to a seed set S, which facilitates the greedy computation of the next seed. Finally, we establish a probabilistic bound on residual updates, which magically holds for the approximate but not for the exact greedy. This bound is a critical component in obtaining near-linear computation of a full approximate greedy sequence.

In Section 3 we consider the threshold influence model [23, 27]. We extend the (approximate) influence oracles and the SKIM reachability-based influence maximization algorithm [15], to obtain oracles and T-SKIM for threshold influence. The extension itself replaces reachability searches with pruned Dijkstra computations. The statistical guarantees on approximation quality are inherited from SKIM. The worst-case running time analysis, establishing that T-SKIM computes the full approximate greedy sequence in near-linear time, required our probabilistic bound on residual updates.

In Section 4, we present *distance-based influence oracles*, which take as input a seed set S and (*any*) decay function α, which can be specified at query time. As explained earlier, many different decay/kernel functions are used extensively in practice, which makes the flexibility of the oracle to handle arbitrary α valuable. Our oracle computes a novel sketch for each node; the *combined All-Distances sketch* (cADS), which generalizes All-Distances Sketches (ADS) [5, 11, 12, 16, 17], used for closeness centrality computation, to multiple instances or probabilistic models. These per-node sketches have expected size at most $k\ln(n\min\{k,\ell\})$ (with good concentration), where n is the number of nodes, ℓ is the number of instances, and k is a sketch parameter that determines a trade-off between information and the amounts of computation and space required. We estimate the distance-based influence of a seed set S from the sketches of the nodes in S. Our estimator uses HIP probabilities [12] with the L* estimator [13], which optimally uses the information in the sketches, and has worst-case coefficient of variation (CV) $\leq 1/\sqrt{2k-2}$.

In Section 5 we present α-SKIM, the first scalable influence maximization algorithm that applies with general decay functions α. Our design is a strong contribution from both theoretical and practical perspectives, providing a novel near-linear worst-case bound on the computation, performance guarantees that nearly match those of exact GREEDY, and a scalable implementation that runs on large networks. The heart of our design is a novel algorithmic technique of efficiently maintaining weighted samples from influence sets that allows us to accurately estimate marginal influences as nodes are added to the seed set.

Section 6 presents a comprehensive experimental evaluation of our algorithms. For threshold influence oracles and maximization, we obtain three orders of magnitude speedups over the algorithms of Du et al. [23], with no loss in quality. Even though both approaches apply the sketches of Cohen [11], we are able to obtain improvements by working with combined sketches, applying better estimators, and, in our IM algorithm, only computing sketches to the point needed to determine the next node. We also show that the

generalization to arbitrary decay functions α is only slightly slower, and can easily handle graphs with hundreds of millions of edges.

We conclude in Section 7.

2. DISTANCE-BASED MODEL

For a set of entities V, *utility* u_{vu} for $v,u \in V$, and a *seed set* $S \subset V$, we define the *influence* of S as

$$\mathsf{Inf}(S) = \sum_{u \in V} \min_{v \in S} u_{uv} \ .$$

Distance-based utility is defined with respect to a non-increasing function α such that $\alpha(\infty) \equiv 0$ and (a set or distribution over) edge-weighted graphs $G = (V,E,w)$, where the nodes correspond to entities and edges $e \in E$ have lengths $w(e) > 0$.

We refer to a single graph G as an *instance*. We denote by d_{vu} the shortest-path distance in G from v to u. When there is no path from v to u in G we define $d_{vu} \equiv \infty$. For a set of nodes S, we let $d_{Su} = \min_{v \in S} d_{vu}$ be the shortest-path distance in G from S to u.

The utility with respect to a single instance is defined as $u_{vu} = \alpha(d_{vu})$, yielding the influence function

$$\mathsf{Inf}(G,S) = \sum_{u \in V} \alpha(d_{Su}).$$

For a set $\mathscr{G} = \{G^{(i)}\}$ of $\ell \geq 1$ instances $G^{(i)} = (V,E^{(i)},w^{(i)})$, we define the utility as the average $u_{vu} = \frac{1}{\ell}\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha(d_{vu}^{(i)})$ and accordingly the influence is the average of the single-instance influence:

$$\mathsf{Inf}(\mathscr{G},S) = \mathsf{Inf}(\{G^{(i)}\},S) = \frac{1}{\ell}\sum_{i \in [\ell]} \mathsf{Inf}(G^{(i)},S). \tag{1}$$

Our algorithms work with inputs specified as a set of one or more instances and with respect to the influence function (1).

A set of instances can be derived from traces or generated by Monte-Carlo simulations of a probabilistic model $\mathscr{G}$. Such a model defines a distribution over instances $G \sim \mathscr{G}$ which share a set V of nodes. The respective utility is then $u_{uv} = \mathsf{E}[\alpha(d_{uv})]$ and the influence of $\mathscr{G}$ is then the expectation

$$\mathsf{Inf}(\mathscr{G},S) = \mathsf{E}_{G \sim \mathscr{G}}\, \mathsf{Inf}(G,S). \tag{2}$$

When Inf is well concentrated around its expectation, a small number of simulations suffices to approximate the results.

2.1 The Exact Greedy Sequence

We present the exact greedy algorithm for the distance-based influence objective $\mathsf{Inf}(\{G^{(i)}\},S)$, as defined in Equation (1). GREEDY starts with an empty seed set $S = \emptyset$. In each iteration, it adds the node with maximum marginal gain, that is, the node u that maximizes the influence of $S \cup \{u\}$. GREEDY thus produces a sequence of nodes, providing an approximation guarantee for the seed set defined by each prefix.

We now elaborate on the computation of the marginal gain of u given S. To do so efficiently as S grows, we work with a *residual problem*. We denote the residual problem of $\mathscr{G}$ with respect to seed set S as $\mathscr{G}|S$. The influence of a set of nodes U in the residual problem is equal to the marginal influence in the original problem:

$$\mathsf{Inf}(\mathscr{G}|S,U) = \mathsf{Inf}(\mathscr{G},S \cup U) - \mathsf{Inf}(\mathscr{G},S).$$

A residual problem has a slightly more general specification. The input has the form $(\mathscr{G},\delta)$, where $\delta_v^{(i)} \geq 0$ maps node-instance pairs (v,i) to nonnegative numbers. The δ values we use for the residual problem $\mathscr{G}|S$ are the respective distances from the seed set (but can be truncated without violating correctness at any distance x in which $\alpha(x) = 0$):

$$\delta_v^{(i)} = d_{Sv}^{(i)} \equiv \min_{u \in S} d_{uv}^{(i)}.$$

When the seed set is empty or the node v is either not reachable from S in instance i or has distance $d_{Sv}^{(i)} > \sup_x\{\alpha(x) > 0\}$, we can use $\delta_v^{(i)} = \infty$ or any $\delta_v^{(i)} > \sup_x\{\alpha(x) > 0\}$, which is equivalent.

We now extend the influence definition for inputs of the form $(\mathscr{G},\delta)$. For a node u, we consider the contribution of each node-instance pair (v,i) to the influence of u:

$$\Delta_{uv}^{(i)} \equiv \max\{0, \alpha(d_{uv}^{(i)}) - \alpha(\delta_v^{(i)})\}. \tag{3}$$

The influence of u in the residual problem is the (normalized) sum of these contributions over all nodes in all instances:

$$\mathsf{Inf}((\mathscr{G},\delta),u) \equiv \frac{1}{\ell}\sum_i \sum_v \Delta_{uv}^{(i)}. \tag{4}$$

It is not hard to verify the following.

LEMMA 2.1. *For any set of nodes U, the influence of U in $\mathscr{G}|S$ is the same as marginal influence of U with respect to S in $\mathscr{G}$.*

Given a residual input $(\mathscr{G},\delta)$, the influence of a node u (which is the same as its marginal influence in the original input $\mathscr{G}$) can be computed using a pruned application of Dijkstra's algorithm from u. A pseudocode is provided as the function `MargGain`(u) in Appendix D.1. The pruning is performed for efficiency reasons by avoiding expanding the search in futile directions. In particular, we can always prune at distance d when $\alpha(d) = 0$ or when $d \geq \delta_v^{(i)}$. The correctness of the pruning follows by observing that all nodes u Dijkstra could reach from the pruned node have $\Delta_{uv}^{(i)} = 0$.

At each step, GREEDY selects a node with maximum influence in the residual input. It then updates the distances δ so that they capture the residual problem $\mathscr{G}|S \cup \{u\}$. A pseudocode for updating δ is provided as the function `AddSeed`(u) in Appendix D.1. To update, we perform a pruned single-source shortest-paths computation in each instance i from u, as in `MargGain`(u).

A straightforward implementation of GREEDY will recompute `MargGain`(u) for all nodes u after each iteration. A common acceleration is instead to perform lazy evaluations: one keeps older values of marginal gains, which are upper bounds on the current values, and updates the current values only for the candidates at the top of the queue as needed to determine the maximum one. Lazy evaluations for reachability-based influence were used by Leskovec et al. [34] in their CELF algorithm. The correctness of lazy evaluations follows from the submodularity and monotonicity of the objective, which imply that the marginal gain of a node can only decrease as the seed set grows.

2.2 Approximate Greedy Sequences

APPROXIMATE GREEDY is similar to exact GREEDY, but in each iteration, instead of selecting a seed node with maximum marginal gain, we select a seed node with marginal contribution that is within a small relative error ε of the maximum with high probability. It also suffices to require that the relative error is bounded by ε in expectation and is concentrated, that is, $\forall a > 1$, the probability of error exceeding $a\varepsilon$ decreases exponentially in a. It turns out that the approximation ratio of APPROXIMATE GREEDY is $1-(1-1/s)^s - O(\varepsilon)$ with corresponding guarantees [15].

The SKIM algorithm applies approximate greedy to reachability-based influence. It works with partial sketches (samples) from "influence sets" of nodes to determine a node with approximately

maximum marginal gain. These partial sketches need to be updated very efficiently after each seed is selected. A critical component for the scalability and accuracy of SKIM is sampling with respect to the residual problem. This is because the marginal influence of a node can be much smaller than its initial influence and we can get good accuracy with a small sample only if we use the residual problem.

The residual problem (and current samples) are updated after each seed selection, both with exact and approximate GREEDY. We now consider the total number of edge traversals used in these updates. With reachability-based influence, with exact or approximate GREEDY, the number of traversals is linear in input size: This is because there can be at most one search which progresses through a node in each instance. Once a node is reachable from the seed set in that instance, it is influenced, and everything reachable from the node in the same instance is reachable, and influenced, as well. So these nodes never need to be visited again and can be removed.

This is not true, however, for distance-based influence: For each node-instance pair (v,i), the distance $\delta_v^{(i)}$ can be updated many times. Moreover, when the distance to the seed set decreases, as a result of adding a new seed node, the node v and its outgoing edges in the instance i are traversed. Therefore, to bound the number of edge traversals we must bound the number of updates of $\delta_v^{(i)}$.

For exact GREEDY, there are pathological inputs with $\Omega(sn)$ updates, which roughly translates to $\Omega(s|E|)$ edge traversals, even on a single instance and threshold influence. [2] On realistic inputs, however, we expect the number of updates to be no more than $\ln s$ per node. This is because even if seed nodes are added in random order, the expected number of times the distance to the seed set decreases is well concentrated around $\ln s$. Therefore, since selected seeds should typically be closer than other nodes, we would expect a small number of updates. Remarkably, we show that our APPROXIMATE GREEDY selection circumvents this worst-case behavior of the exact algorithm and guarantees a near-linear number of updates :

THEOREM 2.1. *Suppose that the approximate greedy selection has the property that for some ε, the next seed is selected in a near uniform way from all nodes with marginal influence that is at least $(1-\varepsilon)$ of the maximum. Then the expected total number of updates of $\delta_v^{(i)}$ at a node-instance pair (v,i) is bounded by $O(\varepsilon^{-1}\log^2 n)$.*

PROOF. Consider the candidate next seeds S' (those with marginal influence that is within $(1-\varepsilon)$ of the maximum). For a node instance pair (v,i), consider all nodes $u \in S'$ with $d_{uv} < \delta_v^{(i)}$. Then the probability that the jth selected node from this group would be closer than all previously selected ones is $1/j$. We obtain that the expected number of updates to $\delta_v^{(i)}$ from nodes in this group is at most $\ln n$. We now consider, for the sake of analysis only, partitioning the greedy selection to steps, according to a decrease by a factor of $(1-\varepsilon)$ of the maximum marginal influence of a node. We showed that the expected number of selections in a step is at most $\ln n$. Also note that the marginal influence of a node can only decrease after another node is selected, so it is possible that it moves to the next step. We now bound the number of steps. Because we are interested in ε approximation, we can stop the greedy algorithm once the maximum marginal influence is below ε/n of the initial one. Therefore, there are at most $\varepsilon^{-1}\log n$ steps. □

[2] Consider a deterministic instance (directed graph) and threshold influence with $T > 1$. The nodes $\{a_i\}$ have edges to all nodes in a set M with length $T(1-i/(2|A|))$ and special nodes $\{b_1,\ldots,b_i\}$ with distance 1. The greedy selection, and in fact also the optimal one, selects the nodes $\{a_i\}$ by decreasing index. But each selection updates the δ for all nodes in M. We can choose number of a nodes roughly $\sqrt{|M|}$ and number of b nodes roughly $|M|$. Obtaining that each of the first $\sqrt{n}$ seeds (where n is the total number of nodes) results in δ updates for $\Omega(n)$ nodes.

3. THRESHOLD INFLUENCE

We present both an oracle and an approximate greedy IM algorithm for threshold influence [23, 27]. In this model, a node is considered influenced by S in an instance if it is within distance at most T from the seed set. Formally, $\alpha(x) = 1$ when $x \le T$ and $\alpha(x) = 0$ otherwise. The simpler structure of the kernel allows for simpler algorithms, intuitively, because the contributions to influence $\Delta_{uv}^{(i)}$ are in $\{0,1\}$, as with reachability-based influence.

3.1 Threshold-Influence Oracle

Our influence oracle for a prespecified threshold T generalizes the reachability-based influence oracle of Cohen et al. [15]. The reachability-based influence oracle preprocesses the input to compute a *combined reachability sketch* for each node. Each node-instance pair is assigned a random permutation rank (a number in $[n\ell]$) and the combined reachability sketch of a node u is a set consisting of the k smallest ranks amongst node-instance pairs (v,i) such that v is reachable from u in instance i. This is also called a bottom-k sketch of reachable pairs. The oracle uses the sketches of the nodes in S to estimate their influence by applying the union size estimator for bottom-k sketches [18]. The combined reachability sketches are built by first computing a set of reachability sketches (one for each node) [11] in each instance and then combining, for each node, the sketches obtained in different instances to obtain one size-k sketch. In turn, the computation for each instance uses reverse (backward) reachability computations. The algorithm of Cohen [11] initiates these reversed reachability searches from all nodes in a random permutation order. These searches are pruned at nodes already visited k times.

For threshold influence, we instead consider a pair (v,i) reachable from u if $d_{uv}^{(i)} \le T$. We then compute for each node the bottom-k sketch of these "reachable" pairs under the modified definition. The oracle estimator [18] is the same one used for the reachability-based case; the estimate has (worst-case) CV that is at most $1/\sqrt{k-2}$ with good concentration. The computation of the sketches is nearly as efficient as for the reachability-based case. Instead of using reverse reachability searches, for threshold influence we use *reverse Dijkstra* computations (single-source shortest-path searches on the graph with reversed edges). These computations are pruned both at distance T and (as with reachability sketches) at nodes already visited k times. The sets of sketches obtained for the different instances are combined as in [15] to obtain a set of combined sketches (one combined sketch with k entries for each node).

The running time is dominated by the computation of the sketches. The preprocessing computation is $O(k\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}|E^{(i)}|\log n)$, the sketch representation is $O(kn)$, and each influence query for a set S takes $O(|S|k\log|S|)$ time.

Oracle for a distance-based IC model.

A distance-based Independent Cascade (IC) model $\mathcal{G}$ is specified by associating an independent random length $w(e) \in [0,+\infty]$ with each edge e according to a distribution that is associated with the edge. The probability that e is live is $p_e = \Pr[w(e) < \infty]$ and its length if it is live is $w(e)$. We use the convention that an edge e that is not explicitly specified has $w(e) \equiv \infty$ (is never live).

As with the IC model for reachability-based influence [15, 36], we can compute oracles based on sketches that have the same size, query time, and approximation guarantees, but with respect to a

distance-based IC model (where the exact influence is defined as the expectation over the model instead of the average of ℓ deterministic instances). The worst-case computation involved, however, is higher. The algorithm performs up to $k = O(\varepsilon^{-2}\log n)$ reverse Dijkstra searches (pruned to distance T) from each node. Each search randomly instantiates incoming edges of scanned nodes according to the model. Pseudocode is provided as Algorithm 1. Note that in contrast to sketching instances, the searches are not pruned at nodes that already have a size-k sketch. Therefore we can not bound the total number of node scans by as we did with instances, and have a worst-case bound of $O(kn^2)$. On the positive size, we do maintain the property that the sketch sizes are k. The correctness arguments of the approximation guarantees with respect to the expectation of the IC model carry over from [15].

Algorithm 1: Build sketches $S(v)$, $v \in V$ for an IC model

```
foreach v ∈ V do S(v) ← ∅;        // Initialize sketches
// Iterate over k random permutations of the
   nodes V
for j = 0,...,k−1 do
    Draw a random permutation of the nodes π : [n] → V
    for i = 1,...,n do
        Perform a reverse Dijkstra search from node π(i)
        pruned to distance T
        foreach scanned node u do
            if |S(u)| < k then
                S(u) ← S(u) ∪ {n∗j+i}
                if all nodes z have |S(z)| = k then
                    exit
                Instantiate and process length and presence of
                incoming edges of u
return S(v) for all v ∈ V
```

3.2 Threshold-Influence Maximization

Our algorithm for threshold influence maximization, which we call T-SKIM, generalizes SKIM [15], which was designed for reachability-based influence. A pseudocode for T-SKIM is provided as Algorithm 3 in Appendix D.2.

Our algorithm T-SKIM builds sketches, but only to the point of determining the node with maximum estimated influence. We then compute a residual problem which updates the sketches. T-SKIM build sketches using reverse single-source shortest path computations that are pruned at distance T (depth-T Dijkstra). As with exact greedy for distance-based influence (Section 2), T-SKIM maintains a residual problem. This requires updating the distances $\delta[v,i] = d^{(i)}_{Sv}$ from the current seed set S, as in `AddSeed`(u), and also updating the sketches to remove the contributions of pairs that are already covered by the seed set.

The (worst-case) estimation quality guarantee of T-SKIM is similar to that of SKIM. When using $k = O(\varepsilon^{-2}\log n)$ we obtain that, with high probability (greater than $1-1/\mathrm{poly}(n)$), for all $s \geq 1$, the influence of the first s selected nodes is at least $1-(1-1/s)^s-\varepsilon$ of the maximum influence of a seed set of size s. The computation time analysis of T-SKIM is deferred to Appendix A.

4. INFLUENCE ORACLE

We now present our oracle for distance-based influence, as defined in Equation (1). We preprocess the input $\mathscr{G}$ to compute a sketch X_v for each node v. Influence queries, which are specified by a seed set S of nodes and *any* function α, can be approximated from the sketches of the query seed nodes.

Note that the same set of sketches can be used to estimate distance-based influence with respect to any non-increasing function α. That is, α can be specified on the fly, after the sketches are computed. When we are only interested in a specific α, such as a threshold function with a given T (Section 3) or reachability-based influence [15], the sketch size and construction time can be reduced.

In the following we present in detail the three components of our oracle: the definition of the sketches, estimation of influence from sketches (queries), and building the sketches (preprocessing).

The sketches are defined in Section 4.1 and we show that for an input specified as either a set of instances or as a distance-based IC model, each sketch X_v has a (well concentrated) expected size that is at most $k\ln(nk)$. The total storage of our oracle is therefore $O(nk\log(nk))$.

The sketch-based influence estimator is presented in Section 4.2. We establish the following worst-case bounds on estimation quality.

THEOREM 4.1. *Influence queries* $\mathsf{Inf}(\mathscr{G},S)$*, specified by a set* S *of seed nodes and a function* α*, can be estimated in* $O(|S|k\log n)$ *time from the sketches* $\{X_u \mid u \in S\}$*. The estimate is nonnegative and unbiased, has CV* $\leq 1/\sqrt{2k-2}$*, and is well concentrated (the probability that the relative error exceeds* $a/\sqrt{k}$ *decreases exponentially with* $a > 1$*).*

We also show that our estimators are designed to fully exploit the information in the sketches in an instance-optimal manner. The preprocessing is discussed in Section 4.3. We show that for a set of ℓ instances $\mathscr{G} = \{G^{(i)}\}$, the preprocessing is performed in expected time $O(k\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}|E^{(i)}|\log n)$.

4.1 Combined ADS

Our *combined* All-Distances Sketches (cADS) are a multi-instance generalization of All-Distances Sketches (ADS) [11, 12, 17] and build on the related combined reachability sketches [15] used for reachability-based influence.

The cADS sketches are randomized structures defined with respect to random rank values $r^{(i)}_u \sim U[0,1]$ associated with each node-instance pair (u,i). To improve estimation quality in practice, we restrict ourselves to a particular form of *structured permutation ranks* [15]: For a set of instances, the ranks are a permutation of $1,\ldots,n\min\{\ell,k\}$, where each block of positions of the form $in,(i+1)n-1$ (for integral i) corresponds to an independent random permutation of the nodes. For each node u, the instances i_j in $r^{(i_j)}_u$, when ordered by increasing rank, are a uniform random selection (without replacement).

For each node v, cADS(v) is a set of rank-distance pairs of the form $(r^{(i)}_u, d^{(i)}_{vu})$ which includes $\min\{\ell,k\}$ pairs of distance 0, that is, all such pairs if $\ell \leq k$ and the k smallest rank values otherwise. It also includes pairs with positive distance when the rank value is at most the kth smallest amongst closer nodes (across all instances). Formally,

$$\mathrm{cADS}(v) = \begin{cases} \left\{(r^{(i)}_v, 0) \mid r^{(i)}_v \in \textsc{bottom-}k\{r^{(j)}_v \mid j \in [\ell]\}\right\} \\ \left\{(r^{(i)}_u, d^{(i)}_{vu}) \mid r^{(i)}_u < \mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{th}}_{(y,j)|d^{(j)}_{vy}<d^{(i)}_{vu}} r^{(j)}_y\right\} \end{cases} . \quad (5)$$

Here BOTTOM-k refers to the smallest k elements in the set and k^{th} denotes the kth smallest element in the set. When there are fewer than k elements, we define k^{th} as the domain maximum. For the purpose of sketch definition, we treat all positive distances across instances as unique; we apply some arbitrary tie-breaking,

for example according to node-instance index, when this is not the case.

The size of cADS sketches is a random variable, but we can bound its expectation. Moreover, $|\text{cADS}(u)|$ is well concentrated around the expectation. The proof resembles that for the basic ADS [11].

LEMMA 4.1. $\forall u$, $E[|\text{cADS}(u)|] \leq k \ln(n \min\{k, \ell\})$.

PROOF. We consider all node-instance pairs (v,i) such that $r_v^{(i)} \in$ BOTTOM-$k\{r_v^{(j)} | j \in [\ell]\}$ by increasing distance from u. The probability that the jth item contributes to $\text{cADS}(u)$ is the probability that its rank is amongst the k smallest in the first j nodes, which is $\min\{1, k/j\}$. Summing over $i \leq |R_u|$ we obtain the bound. □

Note that we can also define cADS sketches with respect to a probabilistic model. The definition emulates working with an infinite set of instances generated according to the model. Since there are at most nk distinct rank values in the sketches, and they are all from the first nk structured permutation ranks, the entries in the sketches are integers in $[nk]$.

4.2 Estimating Influence

Our estimators use the *HIP threshold*, $\tau_v(x)$, defined with respect to a node v and a positive distance value $x > 0$ [12]:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_v(x) &= \text{k}^{\text{th}}_{(u,j)|d_{vu}^{(j)}<x} r_u^{(j)} \\ &= \text{k}^{\text{th}}\{r \mid (r,d) \in \text{cADS}(v) \text{ and } d < x\}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The value $\tau_v(x)$ is the kth smallest rank value amongst pairs (y,j) whose distance $d_{vy}^{(j)}$ is smaller than x. If there are fewer than k pairs with distance smaller than x, then the threshold is defined to be the maximum value in the rank domain. Note that, since the cADS contains the k smallest ranks within each distance, $\tau_v(x)$ is also the kth smallest amongst such pairs that are in $\text{cADS}(v)$. Therefore, the threshold values $\tau_v(x)$ can be computed from $\text{cADS}(v)$ for all x.

The HIP threshold has the following interpretation. For a node-instance pair (u,i), $\tau_v(d_{vu}^{(i)})$ is the largest rank value $r_u^{(i)}$ that would allow the (rank of the) pair to be included in $\text{cADS}(v)$, conditioned on fixing the ranks of all other pairs. We now can consider the probability that the pair (y,j) is included in $\text{cADS}(v)$, fixing the ranks of all pairs other than (y,j). This is exactly the probability that a random rank value is smaller than the HIP threshold $\tau_v(x)$. In particular, if $\tau_v(x)$ is the domain maximum, the inclusion probably is 1. We refer to this probability as the HIP inclusion probability.

When ranks are uniformly drawn from $[0,1]$ the HIP inclusion probability is equal to the HIP threshold $\tau_v(x)$ and we use the same notation. When we work with integral structured ranks, we divide them by $n\ell$ to obtain values in $[0,1]$.

We now present the estimator for the influence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{Inf}(\{G^{(i)}\}, S) &= \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{(v,i)} \max_{u \in S} \alpha(d_{uv}^{(i)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{(v,i)} \alpha(\min_{u \in S} d_{uv}^{(i)}) = \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{(v,i)} \alpha(d_{Sv}^{(i)}) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

from $\{\text{cADS}(u) \mid u \in S\}$. We first discuss $|S| = 1$. We use the HIP estimator [12]

$$\widehat{\mathsf{Inf}}(\{G^{(i)}\}, u) = \alpha(0) + \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{(r,d) \in \text{cADS}(u) | d > 0} \frac{\alpha(d)}{\tau_u(d)}, \tag{8}$$

which is the sum over "sampled" pairs (r,d) (those included in $\text{cADS}(u)$) of the contribution $\alpha(d)/\ell$ of the pair to the influence of u, divided by the HIP inclusion probability of the pair.

LEMMA 4.2. *The estimator* (8) *is unbiased and has CV that is at most* $1/\sqrt{2k-2}$.

PROOF. A node always influences itself (the only node of distance 0 from it), and the estimate for that contribution is $\alpha(0)$. We apply the HIP estimator of [12] to estimate the contribution of nodes with positive distance from u. For a pair (v,i), the HIP estimate is 0 for pairs not in $\text{cADS}(u)$. When the pair is in $\text{cADS}(u)$, we can compute the HIP probability $\tau_u(d_{uv}^{(i)})$ and obtain the estimate $\alpha(d_{uv}^{(i)})/\tau_u(d_{uv}^{(i)})$. Since we are considering node-instance pairs, we divide by the number of instances ℓ. The variance analysis is very similar to [12]. □

We now consider a seed set S with multiple nodes. The simplest way to handle such a set is to generate the *union* cADS, which is a cADS computed with respect to the minimum distances from any node in S. The union cADS can be computed by merging the cADS of the seed nodes using a similar procedure to Algorithm 6 (in Appendix D.3) which will be presented in Section 4.3. We then estimate the contribution of the nodes in S by $|S|\alpha(0)$ and estimate the contribution of all nodes that have a positive distance from S by applying the HIP estimator to the entries in the union cADS. This estimator has the worst-case bounds on estimation quality claimed in Theorem 4.1, but discards a lot of information in the union of the sketches which could be used to tighten the estimate.

4.2.1 Optimal Oracle Estimator

The estimator we propose and implement uses the information in the sketches of nodes in S in an optimal way. This means the variance can be smaller, up to a factor of $|S|$, than that of the union estimator. A pseudocode is provided as Algorithm 4 in Appendix D.3. The estimator first computes the set Z of rank values r that appear with distance 0 in at least one sketch. These ranks correspond to node-instance pairs involving a seed node. For each rank value r that appears in at least one sketch in S and is not in Z (has positive distance in all sketches), we build the set T_r of threshold-contribution pairs that correspond to occurrences of r in sketches of S. We then compute from T_r the sorted *skyline* (Pareto set) $\mathsf{skylines}[r]$ of T_r. The skyline $\mathsf{skylines}[r]$ includes a pair $(\tau,\alpha) \in T_r$ if and only if the pair is not *dominated* by any other pair. That is, any pair with a larger τ value must have a smaller α value. We compute $\mathsf{skylines}[r]$ from T_r as follows. We first sort T_r lexicographically, first by decreasing τ, and then if there are multiple entries with same τ, by decreasing α. We then obtain $\mathsf{skylines}[r]$ by a linear scan of the sorted T_r which removes pairs with a lower α value than the maximum α value seen so far. The entries of the computed $\mathsf{skylines}[r]$ are sorted by decreasing τ_j (and increasing α_j).

For each r for which we computed a skyline (appears in at least one sketch of a node in S and is not in Z), we apply the L* estimator [13] to the sorted $\mathsf{skylines}(r) = \{(\tau_j, \alpha_j)\}$. The pseudocode for L* tailored to our application is in Algorithm 5 in Section D.3, and details on the derivation and applicability of the estimator are provided in Appendix B.

Finally, the influence estimate $\widehat{\mathsf{Inf}}(\{G^{(i)}\}, S)$ returned by Algorithm 4 has two components. The first summand ($|S|\alpha(0)$) is the contribution of the seed nodes themselves. The second component is the sum, over all node-instance pairs of positive distance from S, of their estimated contribution to the influence (normalized by the number of instances ℓ). We estimate this by the sum of the L* estimates applied to $\mathsf{skylines}(r)$.

4.3 Computing the Set of cADS

We compute a set of cADS sketches by computing a set of ADS sketches $\text{ADS}^{(i)}(v)$ for each instance i [11, 12]. The computation

of sketches for all nodes v in a single instance can be done using PRUNED DIJKSTRAS [11, 17] or the node-centric LOCAL UPDATES [12].

An ADS is a cADS of a single instance and has the same basic form: a list of rank-distance pairs sorted by increasing distance. It can have, however, at most one entry of distance 0.

For each node v, we compute cADS(v) by combining ADS$^{(i)}(v)$ for all instances i.A pseudocode for combining two rank-distance lists to a cADS format list is provided as Algorithm 6. The algorithm can be applied repeatedly to ADS$^{(i)}(v)$ and the current cADS(v), or in any combination order of rank-distance lists to obtain the same end result.

The computation of the set of cADS sketches is dominated by computing a set of All-Distances Sketches [11, 12, 17] in each instance. The computation for instance i takes $O(k|E^{(i)}|\log n)$ time.

Algorithm 2: Distance-based IM (α-SKIM)

Input: Directed graphs $\{G^{(i)}(V,E^{(i)},w^{(i)})\}$, α
Output: Sequence of node and marginal influence pairs
// Initialization
rank $\leftarrow$ map node-instance pairs (v,i) to $j/(n\ell)$ where $j \in [n\ell]$;
forall the *node-instance pairs* (v,i) **do** index$[v,i] \leftarrow \perp$; // List of $(u,d_{uv}^{(i)})$ scanned by reverse Dijkstra (v,i)
forall the *pairs* (u,i) **do** $\delta[u,i] \leftarrow \infty$; // Distance from S
forall the *nodes* v **do** Est.$H[v] \leftarrow 0$; Est.$M[v] \leftarrow 0$ seedlist $\leftarrow \perp$ // List of seeds & marg. influences
forall the *node-instance pairs* (v,i) **do** Insert (v,i) to Qpairs with priority $\alpha(0)/$rank$[v,i]$; // Initialize Qpairs
$s \leftarrow 0$; $\tau \leftarrow \alpha(0)n\ell/(2k)$; *coverage* $\leftarrow 0$ // coverage of current seed set
while *coverage* $< n\ell\alpha(0)$ **do**
  // Build PPS samples of marginal influence sets until confidence in next seed
  while $((x,\hat{I}_x) \leftarrow$ NextSeed$()) = \perp$ **do**
    $\tau \leftarrow \tau\lambda$; MoveUp() // Update est. components
    forall the *pairs* (v,i) *in* Qpairs *with priority* $\geq \tau$ **do**
      Remove (v,i) from Qpairs
      Resume reverse Dijkstra from (v,i). **foreach** *scanned node* u *of distance* d **do**
        $c \leftarrow \alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta[v,i])$;
        if $c \leq 0$ **then** Terminate rev. Dijkstra from (v,i) **if** $c/$rank$[v,i] < \tau$ **then**
          place (v,i) with priority $c/$rank$[v,i]$ in Qpairs; Pause reverse Dijkstra from (v,i)
        else // $c/$rank$[v,i] \geq \tau$
          append (u,d) to index$[v,i]$
          if $c \geq \tau$ **then** Est.$H[u] \stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} c$; // H entry
          else // M entry
          Est.$M[u] \stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} 1$
          if HM$[v,i] = \perp$ **then**
            HM$[v,i] \leftarrow |$index$[v,i]|$; Insert (v,i) with priority c to Qhml
          Update the priority of u in Qcands to Est.$H[u] + \tau$Est.$M[u]$
  // Process new seed node x
  $I_x \leftarrow 0$ // Exact marginal influence
  foreach *instance* i **do**
    Perform a forward Dijkstra from x in $G^{(i)}$. **foreach** *visited node* v *at distance* d **do**
      if $d \geq \delta[v,i]$ **then** Prune**else**
        priority(v,i) in Qpairs $\stackrel{-}{\leftarrow} \frac{\alpha(d)-\alpha(\delta[v,i])}{\text{rank}[v,i]}$;
        if *priority of* (v,i) *in* Qpairs ≤ 0 **then** terminate rev. Dijkstra (v,i) and remove (v,i) from Qpairs
        MoveDown$((v,i),\delta[v,i],d)$;
        $I_x \stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} \alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta[v,i])$; $\delta[v,i] \leftarrow d$
  $s \stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} 1$; *coverage* $\stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} I_x$; seedlist.append$(x,\hat{I}_x/\ell,I_x/\ell)$
return seedlist

5. INFLUENCE MAXIMIZATION

We present α-SKIM (pseudocode in Algorithm 2), which computes an approximate greedy sequence for distance-based influence with respect to an arbitrary non-increasing α. The input to α-SKIM is a set of instances $\mathscr{G}$ and a decay function α. The output is a sequence of nodes, so that each prefix approximates the maximum influence seed set of the same size.

Like exact greedy (Section 2) and T-SKIM (Section 3), α-SKIM maintains a residual problem, specified by the original input $\mathscr{G}$ and distances $\delta_v^{(i)}$. It also maintains, for each node, a sample of its influence set, weighted by the respective contribution of each element. The sampling is governed by a global sampling threshold τ, which inversely determines the inclusion probability in the sample (the lower τ is, the larger is the sample). The weighted sample has the same role as the partial sketches maintained in T-SKIM, as it allow us to estimate the influence of nodes.

At a high level, α-SKIM alternates between two subroutines. The first subroutine examines the influence estimates of nodes. We pause if we have sufficient confidence that the node with the maximum *estimated* influence (in the current residual problem) has actual influence that is sufficiently close to the maximum influence. Otherwise, we decrease τ, by multiplying it by a (fixed) $\lambda < 1$ (we used $\lambda = 0.5$ in our implementation), extend the samples, and update the estimates on the influence of nodes to be with respect to the new threshold τ. We pause only when we are happy with the node with maximum estimated influence.

The second subroutine is invoked when a new node x is selected to be added to the seed set; α-SKIM updates the residual problem, that is, the distances δ and the samples.

We provide an overview of our presentation of the components of α-SKIM. In Section 5.1 we precisely define the weighted samples we use. In Section 5.2 we present our main data structure, index, which stores the (inverted) samples. The building of index, which dominates the computation, is done using applications of pruned reverse Dijkstra, discussed in Section 5.3. The selection of the next seed node is detailed in Section 5.4. The samples are defined with respect to the current residual problem and the sampling threshold τ. Therefore, they need to be updated when τ is decreased or when a new seed node is selected. While the new estimates can always be computed by simply scanning index, this is inefficient. In Section 5.5 we present additional structures which support efficient updates of samples and estimates. Finally, Section 5.6 includes a worst-case analysis.

5.1 PPS Samples of Influence Sets

We start by specifying the sampling scheme, which is the core of our approach. The sample we maintain for each node u is a *Probability Proportional to Size* (PPS) sample of all node-instance pairs (v,i), where the weighting is with respect to the contribution values $\Delta_{uv}^{(i)}$, as defined in Equation (3). Recall from Equation (4) that the influence, which we are estimating from the sample, is the sum of these contributions. PPS sampling can be equivalently defined with respect to a threshold τ [43]: Each entry (v,i) has an independent $r_v^{(i)} \sim U[0,1]$ and it is included in the sample of u if

$$\frac{\Delta_{uv}^{(i)}}{r_v^{(i)}} \geq \tau. \tag{9}$$

From the PPS sample we can unbiasedly estimate the influence of u, using the classic inverse-probability estimator [28]. We denote by H_u the set of all pairs (v,i) such that $\Delta_{uv}^{(i)} \geq \tau$ and by M_u the set of all other sampled pairs, that is, those where $\Delta_{uv}^{(i)} \in [r_v^{(i)}\tau, \tau)$. Note

that pairs in H_u are sampled with probability 1, whereas pairs in M_u are sampled with probability $\frac{\Delta^{(i)}(u)}{\tau}$ (this is the probability of having a rank value so that (9) is satisfied). The estimate is the sum of the ratio of contribution to inclusion probability:

$$\widehat{\mathsf{Inf}}((\mathscr{G},\delta),u) = \frac{1}{\ell}\left(\tau|M_u| + \sum_{(v,i)\in H_u} \Delta^{(i)}_{uv}\right). \tag{10}$$

With PPS sampling, when τ is low enough so that the estimate is at least $k\tau$, which always happens when we have k samples, the CV is at most $1/\sqrt{k}$. The estimate is also well concentrated according to the Chernoff bound.

We note that our use of PPS sampling, rather than uniform sampling, is critical to performance with general α. When using (for example) exponential or polynomial decay, the positive contributions of different pairs to the influence of a node can vary by orders of magnitude. Therefore, we must use weighted sampling, where heavier contributions are more likely to be sampled, to obtain good accuracy with a small sample size. With threshold influence, in contrast, contributions were either 0 or 1, which meant that we could get good performance with uniform sampling.

The PPS samples we will maintain for different nodes are computed with respect to the same threshold τ. The samples are also *coordinated*, meaning that the same values $r^{(i)}_v$ are used in the samples of all nodes. Coordination also helps us to maintain the samples when the contribution values Δ are modified, since the sample itself minimally changes to reflect the new values [8, 19, 38]. In our implementation, node-instance pairs are assigned structured random permutation ranks, which are integers in $[n\ell]$, and for permutation rank h we use $\mathsf{rank}[v,i] \equiv r^{(i)}_v = h/(n\ell)$.

5.2 The Index Structure

The main structure we maintain is index, which can be viewed as an inverted index of the PPS samples (but technically can include entries that used to be included in the PPS sample and may still be relevant). For each node-instance pair (v,i), $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$ is an ordered list of node-distance pairs $(u,d^{(i)}_{uv})$. Note that typically the lists are empty or very small for most pairs (v,i). The list is ordered by increasing $d^{(i)}_{uv}$, which is the order in which a reverse Dijkstra algorithm performed from v on the graph $G^{(i)}$ (with all edges reversed) scans new nodes. List $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$ always stores (a prefix) of the scanned nodes, in scanning order. It always includes all nodes u for which the pair (v,i) is included in the PPS sample of u, that is, nodes u that satisfy (9). Each list $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$ is trimmed from its tail so that it only contains entries (u,d) where $\Delta^{(i)}_{uv} > 0$, that is, $\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta^{(i)}_v) > 0$. This is because other entries have no contribution to the marginal influence of u. Note that the lists are always a prefix of the Dijkstra scan order, and once they are trimmed (from the end), they do not grow, and the respective reverse Dijkstra computation never resumed, even if τ decreases.

Each list $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$ is logically viewed as having three consecutive parts (that could be empty). The H part of the list are all entries (u,d) with $\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta^{(i)}_v) \geq \tau$. These are the nodes u for which the pair (v,i) contributes to the H_u part of the PPS sample. The M part of the list are all entries with $\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta^{(i)}_v) \in [r^{(i)}_v\tau, \tau)$, which include nodes u for which (v,i) contributes to M_u. Finally, the L part of the list includes nodes for which $0 < \alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta^{(i)}_v) < r^{(i)}_v\tau$. The L nodes do not currently include (v,i) in the PPS sample of their influence sets, but are still relevant, since this may change when τ decreases.

To support efficient updates of this classification, we maintain $\mathsf{HM}[v,i]$ and $\mathsf{ML}[v,i]$, which contain the positions in the list $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$ of the first M and the first L items (and are empty if there are no M or L items, respectively).

To efficiently compute the influence estimates, we maintain for each node u the values

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{Est}.H[u] &= \sum_{(v,i)|\Delta^{(i)}_{uv}\geq\tau} \Delta^{(i)}_{uv} \\ \mathsf{Est}.M[u] &= |\{(v,i) \mid \Delta^{(i)}_{uv} \in [r^{(i)}_v\tau, \tau)\}| \end{aligned}$$

The PPS estimate (10) on the influence of u is

$$\frac{1}{\ell}(\mathsf{Est}.H[u] + \tau\mathsf{Est}.M[u]) \,. \tag{11}$$

5.3 Reverse Dijkstra Computations

We build the samples using reverse Dijkstra computations starting at node-instance pairs (v,i). The computation is from source v in the transpose graph of $G^{(i)}$ and reveals all nodes u for which the pair (v,i) is included in the PPS sample for u as defined in (9). The nodes scanned by the reverse Dijkstra on $[v,i]$ are maintained as $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$, in the same order. The computation for (v,i) is paused once the distance d from the source satisfies

$$\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta^{(i)}_v) < r^{(i)}_v\tau. \tag{12}$$

The computation may resume when τ is decreased and the pause rule (12) no longer holds. It is not hard to verify that this pause rule suffices to obtain all entries of (v,i) in the PPS samples of nodes. When the depth d satisfies $\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta^{(i)}_v) \leq 0$, the computation of the reverse Dijkstra (v,i) is (permanently) terminated, releasing all auxiliary data structures. Note that the reverse Dijkstra computations for different pairs are paused and resumed according to the global threshold τ, and can be performed concurrently.

The algorithm maintains "state" for all active Dijkstras. We use the notation $\mu(v,i) = d$ for the next distance the reverse Dijkstra from (v,i) would process when resumed. Initially, $\mu(v,i) = 0$. In order to efficiently determine the pairs (v,i) for which reverse Dijkstra needs to be resumed, we maintain a max priority queue Qpairs over node-instance pairs (v,i), prioritized by

$$\frac{\alpha(\mu(v,i)) - \alpha(\delta^{(i)}_v)}{r^{(i)}(v)} \,. \tag{13}$$

This priority is the sampling threshold that is required to get (v,i) into the PPS sample of the next node to be scanned by the reverse Dijkstra of (v,i). We only need to resume the reverse Dijkstra (v,i) when its priority (13) is at least τ. Note that the priority of a pair (v,i) can only decrease over time, when $\delta^{(i)}_v$ decreases or when the reverse Dijkstra progresses and $\mu(v,i)$ increases. This allows us to maintain Qpairs with lazy updates.

In order to determine, after we decrease τ, all the pairs for which the reverse Dijkstra computation should resume (or start), we simply extract all the top elements of the queue Qpairs which have priority at least τ. These top elements are removed from Qpairs. The reverse Dijkstra is resumed on each removed pair (v,i) until the pause rule holds again, that is, we reach a distance d such that $\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta^{(i)}_v) < r^{(i)}_v\tau$. At this point the reverse Dijkstra is terminated or paused. If it is paused, we set $\mu(v,i) \leftarrow d$, and the pair (v,i) is placed in Qpairs with the new priority (13).

Note that the resume and pause rules of the reverse Dijkstras are consistent with identifying all sampled pairs according to (9), ensuring correctness.

Table 1: Performance of TSKIM using $k = 64$, $\ell = 64$, and exponentially distributed edge weights. We evaluate the influence on 512 (different) sampled instances for thresholds 0.1 and 0.01.

			Influence [%]				Running Time [sec]					
			50 seeds		1000 seeds		50 seeds		1000 seeds		n seeds	
instance	# nodes	# edges	0.01	0.1	0.01	0.1	0.01	0.1	0.01	0.1	0.01	0.1
AstroPh	14,845	239,304	1.02	19.17	9.96	39.25	0.9	2.0	2.0	4.0	3.7	6.6
Epinions	75,888	508,837	0.53	8.52	2.88	12.68	2.0	5.2	6.3	11.1	14.1	21.3
Slashdot	77,360	828,161	0.72	19.97	3.90	25.04	1.9	14.6	7.6	27.9	18.9	40.5
Gowalla	196,591	1,900,654	0.62	14.13	1.93	17.61	4.4	21.8	14.8	36.9	47.6	81.7
TwitterF's	456,631	14,855,852	0.20	19.38	1.64	24.26	9.9	133.4	36.4	269.6	269.9	648.4
LiveJournal	4,847,571	68,475,391	0.07	9.16	0.33	13.81	34.6	606.0	117.5	1,244.4	1,983.4	4,553.9
Orkut	3,072,627	234,370,166	2.82	74.44	4.61	77.47	779.7	5,490.5	1,788.7	11,060.7	7,360.9	24,520.3



Figure 1: Evaluating influence permutations (left) and running times (right) on several instances for threshold decays 0.01 and 0.1. The legend applies to all plots.

5.4 Selecting the Next Seed Node

The algorithm decreases τ until we have sufficient confidence in the node with maximum estimated marginal influence. The selection of the next node into the seed set is given in the pseudocode `NextSeed` in Appendix D.4.

We first discuss how we determine when we are happy with the maximum estimate. When looking at a particular node, and the value of the estimate is at least τk, we know that the value is well concentrated with CV that is $1/\sqrt{k}$. We are, however, looking at the maximum estimate among n nodes. To ensure an expected relative error of ε in the worst case, we need to apply a union bound and use $k = O(\varepsilon^{-2} \log n)$. The union bound ensures that the estimates for all nodes have a well concentrated maximum error of ε times the maximum influence. In particular, the estimated maximum has a relative error of ε with good concentration.

In practice, however, the influence distribution is skewed and therefore the union bound is too pessimistic [15]. Instead, we propose the following adaptive approach which yields tighter bounds for realistic instances. Consider the node u with maximum estimated marginal influence $\hat{I}_u$ and let I_u be its exact marginal influence I_u. The exact marginal influence can be compute, using `MargGain(`u`)` (Section 2), and is also computed anyway when u is added to the seed set.

The key to the adaptive approach is the following observation. When working with a parameter $k = \varepsilon^{-2}$ and the maximum estimate is at least $k\tau$, then under-estimates of the true maximum are still well concentrated but over-estimates can be large. Fortunately, however, over-estimates are easy to test for by comparing I_u and $\hat{I}_u(1-\varepsilon)$.

We can use this as follows. In our experiments we run the algorithm with a fixed k, always selecting the node with maximum estimate when the estimate exceeds $k\tau$. We obtain, however, much tighter confidence interval than through the worst case bound. In particular, for the sequence of computed seeds, we track the sum $Er = \sum_u \max\{0, (1-\varepsilon)\hat{I}_u - I_u\}$. This sum is added as a fixed component to the confidence bound, which means that with high probability the error for any prefix size is Er plus a well concentrated value around ε times the estimate. In particular, the approximation ratio we obtain with good probability for a prefix s is at least $1-(1-1/s)^s - \varepsilon - Er/\widehat{\mathsf{Inf}}$.

Alternatively, (this is in the pseudocode) we can perform seed selection with respect to a specified accuracy ε. Thus obtaining approximation ratio of $1-(1-1/s)^s - \varepsilon$ with good probability. We use k that is ε^{-2} but when we have a candidate (a node with maximum estimated marginal gain which exceeds $k\tau$) we apply `MargGain(`u`)` to compute its exact marginal influence I_u. If we find that $\hat{I}_u \geq (1-\varepsilon)I_u$, we do not select u and instead decrease τ which returns to sampling. Otherwise, we select u into the seed set.

We now consider tracking the node with maximum estimated influence. To do that efficiently, we work with a max priority queue Qcands, which contains nodes prioritized by their estimated influence, or more precisely, by $\mathsf{Est}.H[u] + \tau\mathsf{Est}.M[u]$. For efficiency, we use lazy updates, which allows priorities not to be promptly updated when the estimate changes and instead, updated only for elements which are the current maximum in the queue.

The function `NextSeed` repeats the following until a node is selected or $\perp$ is returned. If the maximum estimated priority in Qcands is less than τk, we return $\perp$. Otherwise, we remove from Qcands the node u with maximum priority, compute $\hat{I}_u \leftarrow \mathsf{Est}.H[u] + \tau\mathsf{Est}.M[u]$, and check if $\hat{I}_u$ is at lest the current maximum entry on the queue and is larger than τk. When using the first option, we simply return $(u, \hat{I}_u)$. When working with a specified error, we further test u as follows. We compute the actual marginal gain I_u of u. If it is lower than $(1-\varepsilon)\hat{I}_u$, we place u back in Qcands with priority I_u and return $\perp$. Otherwise, we return u.

We now consider maintaining Qcands. Priorities are promptly updated to estimate values only when there is a possibility of increase

in the estimate. This is necessary for correctness of the priority queue when using lazy updates. The estimated influence of a node u can only decrease when δ decreases for an element in the sample of u (as a result of adding a new seed) or when τ decreases and no new entries are added to the sample. Therefore, in these cases, we do not update the priorities promptly. The priority of u in Qcands is promptly updates when (as a result of decreasing τ) a new entry is added to the sample of u.

Note that our algorithm always maintains the estimation components $\mathsf{Est}.H[u]$ and $\mathsf{Est}.M[u]$ updated for all nodes u, so the current estimate for a node u can at any time be quickly computed from these two values and the current τ.

Lastly, as in the pseudocode, Algorithm 2 is executed to exhaustion, until the seed set influences all nodes. The algorithm can be stopped also when the seed set S is of certain desired size or when a desired coverage $\sum_{u\in S} I_u/(n\ell\alpha(0))$ is achieved.

5.5 Updating PPS Estimate Components

The positions $\mathsf{HM}[v,i]$ and $\mathsf{ML}[v,i]$, and accordingly the classification of entries (u,d) as H,M, or L, can be updated both when τ or $\delta_v^{(i)}$ decreases. When τ decreases, entries can only "move up:" L entries can become M or H entries and M entries can become H entries. New entries can also be generated by a reverse Dijkstra on (v,i). Newly generated entries are always H or M entries. When $\delta_v^{(i)}$ decreases, entries can "move down." In addition, entries at the tail of $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$, those with $\alpha(d) \le \alpha(\delta_v^{(i)})$, get removed.

When an entry (u,d) changes its classification, or when a new entry is generated by a reverse Dijkstra, we may need to update the estimate components $\mathsf{Est}.H[u]$ and $\mathsf{Est}.M[u]$.

5.5.1 Initial Updates When τ Decreases

When τ decreases, we first (before resuming the reverse Dijkstra's) need to update the classification of existing entries and the implied changes on Est. The pseudocode for this update is provided as the function `MoveUp()` in Appendix D.4.

To efficiently identify the index lists that have entries that change their classification, we maintain a max priority queues Qhml. It contains node-instance pairs with priority equal to the *reclassification threshold*, the highest τ that would require reclassification of at least one entry in the list. The procedure `UpdateReclassThresh` computes the reclassification threshold for a pair (v,i) and places the pair with this priority in Qhml. When τ is decreased, we only need to process lists of pairs that are at the top of the queue Qhml.

Lastly, we discuss the processing of a list (v,i) which requires reclassification. The reclassification, the updates of the estimation components Est, and the update of the reclassification threshold using `UpdateReclassThresh(v,i)`, are all performed in computation that is proportional to the number of reclassified entries. In particular, processing does not require scanning the full list $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$. This is enabled by the pointers $\mathsf{HM}[v,i]$ and $\mathsf{ML}[v,i]$.

5.5.2 New Scanned Node

The estimation components also need to be updated when a new entry is appended to the $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$ list when running a reverse Dijkstra for (v,i). The pseudocode for this update is included in Algorithm 2. The new scanned node u with distance d creates a new entry (u,d) which is appended to the end of $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$. A new entry is always an H or M entry (otherwise the pause rule applies). If $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] \neq \perp$, that is, there is at least one M entry in $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$, the new entry must also be an M entry. In this case, we increase $\mathsf{Est}.M[u]$ by 1. If $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] = \perp$, we check if $(c \leftarrow \alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta_v^{(i)})) \ge \tau$. If so, the new entry is an H entry and we increase $\mathsf{Est}.H[u]$ by c. Otherwise, it is the first M entry. We set $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] \leftarrow |\mathsf{index}[v,i]| - 1$, $\mathsf{Est}.M[u] = 1$, and insert the pair (v,i) to the queue Qhml with priority c. After updates are completed, we recompute the estimated influence $\mathsf{Est}.H[u] + \tau\mathsf{Est}.M[u]$ of the node u and update accordingly the priority of u in Qcands.

5.5.3 New Seed Node

When a new seed node u is selected, we perform a forward Dijkstra from the seed in each instance i. We update $\delta_v^{(i)}$ at visited nodes v and compute the exact marginal influence of the new seed. The forward Dijkstra is pruned at nodes v with $\delta_v^{(i)}$ that is smaller or equal to their distance from u. When we update $\delta_v^{(i)}$, we also may need to reclassify entries in $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$, update the positions $\mathsf{HM}[v,i]$ and $\mathsf{ML}[v,i]$ and update estimation components $\mathsf{Est}.H[u]$ and $\mathsf{Est}.M[u]$ of reclassified entries (u,d) . A pseudocode for this update is provided as the function `MoveDown()` in Appendix D.4. We also update the priority of the pair (v,i) in Qhml and decrease its priority in Qpairs to $(\alpha(\mu(v,i)) - \alpha(\delta_v^{(i)}))/r_v^{(i)}$ (since we do not track $\mu(v,i)$ explicitly in the pseudocode, we instead decrease the priority to reflect the decrease in $\delta_v^{(i)}$). If the updated priority in Qpairs is ≤ 0, the reverse Dijkstra of (v,i) is terminated and it is removed from Qpairs. Note that in this update, entries can only be reclassified "down:" E.g. an entry (u,d) that was in H can move to M, L, or be purged, if $\alpha(d) \le \alpha(\delta_v^{(i)})$.

5.6 Analysis

When we run the algorithm with fixed $k = O(\varepsilon^{-2}\log n)$ or use the adaptive approach in seed selection (as detailed in Section 5.4), we have the following guarantee on the approximation quality:

THEOREM 5.1. α-SKIM *returns a sequence of seeds so that for each prefix S of size s, with high probability,*

$$\mathsf{Inf}(\mathscr{G},S) \ge (1-(1-1/s)^s-\varepsilon) \max_{U||U|=s} \mathsf{Inf}(\mathscr{G},U). \tag{14}$$

PROOF. The algorithm, with very high probability, selects a node with marginal influence that is at least $1-\varepsilon$ of the maximum one. This follows from a union bound over all steps and nodes of the quality of the estimate obtained from a PPS sample. We then apply an approximate variant (e.g., [15]) of the classic proof [37] of the approximation ratio of GREEDY for monotone submodular problems. □

The worst-case bound on the (expected) running time of α-SKIMis as follows.The proof is provided in Appendix C. We note that our design exploits properties of real instances and the poly-logarithmic overheads are not observed in experiments.

THEOREM 5.2. α-SKIM *runs in expected time*

$$O\left(\frac{\log^3 n}{\varepsilon}\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}|E^{(i)}| + \frac{\log^3 n}{\varepsilon^3}n + \frac{\log n}{\varepsilon^2}|\bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell}E^{(i)}|\right)$$

providing the guarantee (14).

6. EXPERIMENTS

Our algorithms were implemented in C++ and compiled using Visual Studio 2013 with full optimization. Our test machine runs Windows 2008R2 Server and has two Intel Xeon E5-2690 CPUs and 384 GiB of DDR3-1066 RAM. Each CPU has 8 cores (2.90 GHz, 8×64 kiB L1, 8×256 kiB, and 20 MiB L3 cache). For consistency, all runs are sequential.

The datasets in our experiments are obtained from the SNAP [44] project and represent *social* (Epinions, Slashdot [35], Gowalla [10], TwitterFollowers [22], LiveJournal [2], Orkut [47]) and *collaboration* (AstroPh [33]) networks. All these graphs are unweighted.

Unless otherwise mentioned, we test our algorithms using $\ell = 64$ independent instances generated from the graph by assigning independent random length to every edge according to an exponential distribution with expected value 1 [1, 14, 27]. To do so, we sample a value x uniformly at random from the range $(0, 1]$, then set the edge length to $-\ln x$. We use ADS parameter $k = 64$.

6.1 Distance-Based Influence Maximization

We start with the Influence Maximization problem. Recall that we consider two variants of this problem: threshold influence and general distance-based influence. We discuss each in turn.

6.1.1 Threshold Influence

Our first experiment considers the performance of T-SKIM (Algorithm 3, Section 3), which finds a sequence of seed nodes such that each prefix of the sequence approximately maximizes the influence. Our results are summarized in Table 1. For each dataset, we first report its total numbers of nodes and edges. This is followed by the total influence (as a percentage of the total number of nodes of the graph) of the seed set found by our algorithm. We report figures for 50 and 1000 seeds and for threshold values $T = 0.01$ and $T = 0.1$. Finally, we show the total running time of our algorithm when it is stopped after computing an approximate greedy sequence of 50, 1000, or *all n nodes*. Note that we omit the respective influence figure for the seed set that contains all nodes, since it is 100% by definition.

The table shows that, unsurprisingly, the higher threshold has higher influence values. This is because the coverage function is monotone non-decreasing in T. The running time of our algorithm depends on that influence (since its graph searches must run for longer), but it is still practical even for fairly large thresholds and even if we compute the entire permutation. For the largest graph we test (Orkut), with hundreds of millions of edges, we can compute the top 50 seeds in less than 15 minutes, and order all nodes in a few hours using a single CPU core.

Figure 1 presents a more detailed perspective on the same experiment. It shows, for $T = 0.01$ and $T = 0.1$, how total influence and the running times depend on the size of the seed set. We note that the first few seeds contribute with a disproportionate fraction of the total influence, particularly with $T = 0.1$, and an even higher percentage of the total running time. The overall shape of the curves is quite similar, with Orkut as a noticeable outlier: its first few seeds contribute relatively more to the overall influence than in other instances. Note that Orkut is also the densest instance in our testbed.

We now compare T-SKIM to ConTinEst, the algorithm by Du et al. [23]. Although their sequential implementation is publicly available, we were unable to run it on our inputs within reasonable time. (A preliminary test on AstroPh, our smallest instance, did not produce any output within five hours.) Note that to evaluate graphs with more than 1024 vertices, they actually use a distributed implementation, which they run on a cluster with 192 cores. Unfortunately, we had access neither to such a cluster nor to the distributed implementation of their algorithm.

In order to still be able to make some comparison, we generated the same instances as they used in their evaluation: core-periphery Kronecker networks [44] (parameter matrix: [0.9 0.5; 0.5 0.3]) of varying size, using the Weibull distribution

$$f(x, \lambda, \beta) = \frac{\beta}{\lambda}\left(\frac{x}{\lambda}\right)^{\beta-1} e^{-(x/\lambda)^{\beta}}$$



Figure 2: Left: Comparing T-SKIM to ConTinEst. Right: Error of T-SKIM and α-SKIM.

for the edge lengths [32]. (Note that λ controls scale and β shape.) For each edge we chose λ and β uniformly at random from $(0, 10]$. We ran the same experiment as they did, setting $|S| = 10$, and $T = 10$. Figure 2 (left) shows the running times for Kronecker networks of varying size. We observe that our approach run on a single CPU core is consistently about 3 orders of magnitude faster than their algorithm run on a cluster. Unfortunately, we were not able to compare the computed influence, as those figures are not reported in [23].

6.1.2 General Distance-Based Influence

We now evaluate α-SKIM, a more general version of our IM algorithm that can handle arbitrary decay functions. For this experiment, we consider both harmonic and exponential decay functions, the most commonly used in the literature. To test harmonic decay, we use $\alpha(x) = 1/(10x+1)$; for exponential decay, we use $\alpha = e^{-10x}$. These functions turn out to give interesting influence profiles. In α-SKIM we initialize τ to $n\ell/k$ and set λ to 0.5.

Table 2 shows, for both functions, the influence values (in percent) obtained by α-SKIM for 50 and 1000 seeds, as well as the corresponding running times.

Table 2: Performance of α-SKIM using $k = 64$, $\ell = 64$, and exponentially distributed edge weights for 50 and 1000 seeds. We use exponential (exp.: $\alpha : x \mapsto e^{-10x}$) and harmonic (harm.: $\alpha : x \mapsto 1/(10x+1)$) decay functions.

	INFLUENCE [%]				RUNNING TIME [SEC]			
	50 seeds		1000 seeds		50 seeds		1000 seeds	
instance	exp.	harm.	exp.	harm.	exp.	harm.	exp.	harm.
AstroPh	17.6	31.4	33.5	44.9	15	15	43	40
Epinions	7.6	14.9	11.2	18.2	35	40	93	99
Slashdot	16.9	29.1	21.3	32.8	104	88	238	224
Gowalla	13.1	25.9	15.9	28.2	166	213	323	455
TwitterF's	16.0	26.3	19.7	29.2	1,500	1,387	2,459	2,816
LiveJournal	10.6	23.5	13.4	25.8	5,637	7,765	11,906	13,016

The table shows that α-SKIM is slower than T-SKIM by up to an order of magnitude for comparable influence. In fact, if we ran α-SKIM with a threshold function (not shown in the table), it would be about three times as slow as T-SKIM, while producing the exact same results. However, this is to be expected, since α-SKIM is a much more sophisticated (and flexible) algorithm, which, unlike T-SKIM, can handle smooth decay functions with guarantees.

Even though α-SKIM is slower, it is still practical. It scales well with the number of seeds (increasing from 50 to 1000 barely doubles the total running time) and can still handle very large graphs.



Figure 3: Evaluating influence permutations (left) and running time (right) on several instances for exponential (exp.: $\alpha : x \mapsto e^{-10x}$) and harmonic (harm.: $\alpha : x \mapsto: 1/(10x+1)$) decays. The legend applies to all plots.



Figure 4: Evaluating different numbers of simulations (ℓ-values) for different decay functions on AstroPh.

Figure 3 presents a more detailed view of the same experiment (for a few graphs), with up to n seeds. It shows that computing a full permutation (with n seeds) is not much more expensive than computing $n/1000$ (a few dozen) seeds. An interesting difference between these results and those for T-SKIM (reported in Figure 1) is that for α-SKIM the running time grows less smoothly with the number of seeds. The discontinuities correspond to decreases in the sampling threshold τ, causing additional sampling.

6.1.3 *Solution Quality*

Figure 2 (right) compares the quality of the seed sets found by T-SKIM (for threshold decay) and α-SKIM (for exponential and harmonic decays) with those found by exact GREEDY on AstroPh ($\ell = 64$ simulations). We consider sets of size 1 to 10^3 and the same decay functions as above. Each point of the curve represents the error (in percent) of our algorithm when compared to GREEDY. We observe that the error is very low in general (less than 1% for exponential and harmonic decay, and less than 4% for threshold). Considering the fact that SKIM is many orders of magnitude faster than GREEDY (while still providing strong guarantees), these errors are acceptable. Note that the error of the first seed vertex is very low in all cases (close to 0%), indicating that SKIM does very well in finding the most influential node.

The quality of the solutions provided by the algorithm with respect to the probabilistic input (graph distribution) depends on the number of instances (simulations) ℓ. Our experiments so far have used $\ell = 64$. We now compare this with other choices of ℓ. Figure 4 compares the quality of the seed sets found by GREEDY for AstroPh for $\ell = 4, 16, 64, 128$ with those found by $\ell = 256$. We consider sets of size 1 to 50 and three different decay functions: exponential, harmonic, and threshold (with $T = 0.01$). Each point in the curve represents the error (in percent) relative to the solution with $\ell = 256$. Although the error is consistently high for the threshold IM when ℓ is very small, it becomes negligible for $\ell \geq 64$, justifying our choice of parameters. For smoother (exponential or harmonic) decay, all errors are significantly smaller, and even smaller values of ℓ would be acceptable.

6.2 Distance-Based Influence Oracle

We now evaluate our influence oracles. Recall that this setting has two stages. The preprocessing stage takes as input only the graph and computes sketches. The query stage takes a set S of seeds and a function α and uses the sketches to estimate the influence of S with respect to α. Note that same preprocessing stage can be used to answer queries for any decay function α. For this experiment, we consider three such functions: exponential ($\alpha(x) = e^{-10x}$), harmonic ($\alpha(x) = 1/(10x+1)$), and threshold (with $T = 0.01$).

Table 3 summarizes our results in this setting. For each dataset tested, it first shows the preprocessing time and the total space required to store all sketches. Then, for each decay function, we report the query time (in microseconds) and the estimation error for random sets S of sizes 1, 50, and 1000. (Note that measuring the error requires computing exact influence of each seed set with multiple Dijkstra searches; this time is not included in the table.) Each entry in the table is the average of 100 random seed sets.

The table shows that, as predicted, query times are almost independent of the α function, the size of the influenced set, and the size of the graph. Moreover, they have a slightly superlinear dependence on the number of seeds. Queries are somewhat slower than for reachability-based IC (as reported in [15]), since sketches are bigger and the estimator is more involved. Our oracles are much more flexible, however, and still practical. For 50 seeds, one can answer queries in a few milliseconds, whereas an exact computation could take minutes or more on large graphs. Moreover, its error is consistently low, regardless of the number of seeds.

7. CONCLUSION

We formulate and study a model of *distance-based influence* which captures decay of relevance with distance, and unifies and extends several established research threads. We design novel near-linear algorithms for greedy influence maximization and a construction of influence oracles. In future, we hope to apply our novel weighted-sampling approach for approximate greedy influence maximization to scale up other submodular maximization problems.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank the authors of [23] for helping us reproduce their inputs and pointing us to their implementation of ConTinEst.

8. REFERENCES

[1] B. D. Abrahao, F. Chierichetti, R. Kleinberg, and A. Panconesi. Trace complexity of network inference. In *KDD*, 2013.

[2] L. Backstrom, D. Huttenlocher, J. Kleinberg, and X. Lan. Group formation in large social networks: Membership, growth, and evolution. In *KDD*. ACM, 2006.

[3] A. Bavelas. A mathematical model for small group structures. *Human Organization*, 7:16–30, 1948.

[4] F. Bloch and M. O. Jackson. The formation of networks with transfers among players. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 133(1):83–110, 2007.

[5] P. Boldi and S. Vigna. In-core computation of geometric centralities with hyperball: A hundred billion nodes and beyond. In *ICDM workshops*, 2013. `http://arxiv.org/abs/1308.2144`.

[6] P. Boldi and S. Vigna. Axioms for centrality. *Internet Mathematics*, 2014.

[7] C. Borg, M. Brautbar, J. Chayes, and B. Lucier. Maximizing social influence in nearly optimal time. In *SODA*, 2014.

[8] K. R. W. Brewer, L. J. Early, and S. F. Joyce. Selecting several samples from a single population. *Australian Journal of Statistics*, 14(3):231–239, 1972.

[9] W. Chen, Y. Wang, and S. Yang. Efficient influence maximization in social networks. In *KDD*. ACM, 2009.

[10] E. Cho, S. A. Myers, and J. Leskovec. Friendship and mobility: user movement in location-based social networks. In *SIGKDD*. ACM, 2011.

[11] E. Cohen. Size-estimation framework with applications to transitive closure and reachability. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 55:441–453, 1997.

[12] E. Cohen. All-distances sketches, revisited: HIP estimators for massive graphs analysis. In *PODS*. ACM, 2014.

[13] E. Cohen. Estimation for monotone sampling: Competitiveness and customization. In *PODC*. ACM, 2014. full version `http://arxiv.org/abs/1212.0243`.

[14] E. Cohen, D. Delling, F. Fuchs, A. Goldberg, M. Goldszmidt, and R. Werneck. Scalable similarity estimation in social networks: Closeness, node labels, and random edge lengths. In *COSN*. ACM, 2013.

[15] E. Cohen, D. Delling, T. Pajor, and R. F. Werneck. Sketch-based influence maximization and computation: Scaling up with guarantees. In *CIKM*. ACM, 2014.

[16] E. Cohen and H. Kaplan. Spatially-decaying aggregation over a network: Model and algorithms. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 73:265–288, 2007. Full version of a SIGMOD 2004 paper.

[17] E. Cohen and H. Kaplan. Summarizing data using bottom-k sketches. In *ACM PODC*, 2007.

[18] E. Cohen and H. Kaplan. Leveraging discarded samples for tighter estimation of multiple-set aggregates. In *ACM SIGMETRICS*, 2009.

[19] E. Cohen, H. Kaplan, and S. Sen. Coordinated weighted sampling for estimating aggregates over multiple weight assignments. *VLDB*, 2(1–2), 2009. full: `http://arxiv.org/abs/0906.4560`.

[20] E. Cohen and M. Strauss. Maintaining time-decaying stream aggregates. *J. Algorithms*, 59:19–36, 2006.

[21] Ch. Dangalchev. Residual closeness in networks. *Phisica A*, 365, 2006.

[22] M. De Domenico, A. Lima, P. Mougel, and M. Musolesi. The anatomy of a scientific rumor. *Scientific Reports*, 3, 2013.

[23] N. Du, L. Song, M. Gomez-Rodriguez, and H. Zha. Scalable influence estimation in continuous-time diffusion networks. In *NIPS*. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.

[24] U. Feige. A threshold of $\ln n$ for approximating set cover. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.*, 45:634–652, 1998.

[25] L. C. Freeman. Centrality in social networks: Conceptual clarification. *Social Networks*, 1, 1979.

[26] J. Goldenberg, B. Libai, and E. Muller. Talk of the network: A complex systems look at the underlying process of word-of-mouth. *Marketing Letters*, 12(3), 2001.

[27] M. Gomez-Rodriguez, D. Balduzzi, and B. Schölkopf. Uncovering the temporal dynamics of diffusion networks. In *ICML*, 2011.

[28] D. G. Horvitz and D. J. Thompson. A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 47(260):663–685, 1952.

[29] M. O. Jackson. *Social and economic networks*. Princeton University Press, 2010.

[30] K. Jung, W. Heo, and W. Chen. Irie: Scalable and robust influence maximization in social networks. In *ICDM*. ACM, 2012.

[31] D. Kempe, J. M. Kleinberg, and É. Tardos. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *KDD*. ACM, 2003.

[32] J. F. Lawless. *Statistical models and methods for lifetime data*, volume 362. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

[33] J. Leskovec, J. M. Kleinberg, and C. Faloutsos. Graph evolution: Densification and shrinking diameters. *TKDD*, 1, 2007.

[34] J. Leskovec, A. Krause, C. Guestrin, C. Faloutsos, J. VanBriesen, and Glance N. Cost-effective outbreak detection in networks. In *KDD*. ACM, 2007.

[35] J. Leskovec, K. J. Lang, A. Dasgupta, and M. W. Mahoney. Community structure in large networks: Natural cluster sizes and the absence of large well-defined clusters. *Internet Mathematics*, 6(1):29–123, 2009.

[36] B. Lucier, J. Oren, and Y. Singer. Influence at scale: Distributed computation of complex contagion in networks. In *KDD*, 2015.

[37] G. Nemhauser, L. Wolsey, and M. Fisher. An analysis of the approximations of maximizing submodular set functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 14, 1978.

[38] E. Ohlsson. Coordination of pps samples over time. In *The 2nd International Conference on Establishment Surveys*, pages 255–264. American Statistical Association, 2000.

[39] T. Opsahl, F. Agneessens, and J. Skvoretz. Node centrality in weighted networks: Generalizing degree and shortest paths. *Social Networks*, 32, 2010. `http://toreopsahl.com/2010/03/20/`.

[40] M. Richardson and P. Domingos. Mining knowledge-sharing sites for viral marketing. In *KDD*. ACM, 2002.

[41] M. Rosenblatt. Remarks on some nonparametric estimates of a density function. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 27(3):832, 1956.

[42] G. Sabidussi. The centrality index of a graph. *Psychometrika*, 31(4):581–603, 1966.

[43] C-E. Särndal, B. Swensson, and J. Wretman. *Model Assisted Survey Sampling*. Springer, 1992.

[44] Stanford network analysis project. `http://snap.stanford.edu`.

[45] Y. Tang, Y. Shi, and X. Xiao. Influence maximization in near-linear time: A martingale approach. In *SIGMOD*, 2015.

[46] Y. Tang, X. Xiao, and Y. Shi. Influence maximization: Near-optimal time complexity meets practical efficiency. In *SIGMOD*, 2014.

[47] J. Yang and J. Leskovec. Defining and evaluating network communities based on ground-truth. In *ICDM*, 2012.

Table 3: Evaluating the distance-based influence oracle with $\ell = 64$.

	PREPROCESSING		QUERIES WITH $\alpha\colon x \mapsto e^{-10x}$						QUERIES WITH $\alpha\colon x \mapsto 1/(10x+1)$						QUERIES WITH $T = 0.01$					
			1 seed		50 seeds		1000 seeds		1 seed		50 seeds		1000 seeds		1 seed		50 seeds		1000 seeds	
instance	time [h:m]	space [MiB]	time [µs]	err. [%]	time [µs]	err. [%]	time [µs]	err. [%]	time [µs]	err. [%]	time [µs]	err. [%]	time [µs]	err. [%]	time [µs]	err. [%]	time [µs]	err. [%]	time [µs]	err. [%]
AstroPh	0:10	149.2	38	7.2	9,695	1.2	229,340	0.5	31	4.4	9,152	4.1	227,943	0.5	27	1.1	8,855	0.4	204,551	2.8
Epinions	0:46	674.0	32	3.2	8,552	1.1	222,470	1.0	26	2.2	9,203	1.2	196,717	0.5	22	0.5	8,267	0.3	191,709	0.6
Slashdot	1:10	851.4	46	5.6	11,884	1.5	310,170	0.4	38	3.2	10,970	1.9	291,185	1.2	73	0.6	13,768	0.4	247,509	0.6
Gowalla	3:55	2,558.6	52	3.8	17,109	1.0	356,818	0.4	47	2.9	14,151	2.2	289,318	0.8	61	1.2	16,092	0.6	329,976	0.3
TwitterF's	19:33	6,165.1	51	3.8	13,816	1.4	365,366	0.7	42	2.6	13,166	1.5	379,296	0.9	39	2.3	13,912	0.7	360,766	0.2

APPENDIX

A. RUNNING TIME ANALYSIS FOR T-SKIM

The computation is dominated by two components. The first is the reversed pruned Dijkstra searches which build the inverted sketches. The second is the forward pruned Dijkstra searches that we use to compute and update the residual problem after a new seed node is selected. In both components we use pruned shortest-paths computations (whereas SKIM for reachability-based influence uses generic searches). The bound on the number of reversed edge traversals performed for sketch building and the analysis deriving this bound are essentially the same as with reachability-based SKIM [15]: We bound the total number of increments to the entries in the array size. Each entry in that array corresponds to a node and the size (number of entries) in the partial sketch. Recall that the sketches themselves are maintained in an inverted structure.

The number of forward traversals from u in instance i corresponds to the number of times the distance $\delta[u,i]$ of node u in instance i from the seed set is updated. As we discussed in Section 2.2 the worst-case number of updates can depend on the number of seeds with exact distance-based greedy. The approximate selection of T-SKIM, however, is such that all seed nodes with marginal influence that is close to the maximum one (within $k^{-0.5}$) have approximately the same probability of being selected. This means that we can invoke Theorem 2.1 to obtain an expected $O(\varepsilon^{-1}\log^2 n)$ bound.

We therefore obtain the following time bound for an exhaustive execution of T-SKIM (until influence of S approaches n):

THEOREM A.1. *T-SKIM guarantees with high probability, for all s, that the first s selected seeds have influence that is at least $1-(1-1/s)^s-\varepsilon$ times the maximum influence of a seed set of size s, and runs in expected time*

$$O(\varepsilon^{-1}\sum_i |E^{(i)}|\log^3 n + m\varepsilon^{-2}\log^3 n)\ , \tag{15}$$

where $m \leq |\bigcup_i E^{(i)}|$ is the sum over nodes of the maximum in-degree over instances.

We note that this upper bounds the worst-case behavior. Our experiments verify that typically the computation is dominated by the reverse searches and the number of edge traversals is much smaller. We propose another solution of theoretical interest which provides worst-case robustness of the number of forward traversals at the cost of a slight softening of the sharp threshold. This design was not implemented.

We first formalize the notion of a softened threshold T in the influence function: For a parameter $\nu \in (0,1)$, we only require approximation with respect to the maximum influence of a seed set of size s *when the threshold is* $(1-\nu)T$. Since we expect the value of the threshold used in an application not be precise anyway, this relaxation approximates the intended semantics of using a threshold of T.

We next outline a slight modification of T-SKIM which provides a bound on the running time and approximation quality with respect to the soft threshold.

THEOREM A.2. *Our modified T-SKIM, guarantees with high probability, for all s that the first s selected seeds have influence for threshold function $\alpha(x) = x \leq T\,?\,1:0$ that is at least $1-(1-1/s)^s-\varepsilon$ times the maximum influence of a seed set of size s with respect to a threshold function $\alpha(x) = x \leq (1-\nu)T\,?\,1:0$. The algorithm runs in time*

$$O(\nu^{-1}\sum_i |E^{(i)}|\log n + m\varepsilon^{-2}\log^3 n)\ , \tag{16}$$

where $m \leq |\bigcup_i E^{(i)}|$ is the sum over nodes of the maximum in-degree over instances.

PROOF. We outline the modifications needed to support the soft threshold.

In the forward searches, we only propagate updates to $\delta[v,i]$ when the decrease in distance is at least νT. In particular, the reversed Dijkstras are always pruned at distance $T(1-\nu)$ and the forward Dijkstras are pruned when $d \leq T$ or $d > \delta[v,i]-\nu T$. This means that at any given time, if $d_{Sv}^{(i)} \leq (1-\nu T)$ then $\delta[v,i] \in [d_{Sv}^{(i)}, d_{Sv}^{(i)}+\nu T]$. That is, node-instance pairs of distance at most $(1-\nu)T$ are counted as influenced and pairs of distance greater than T are not influenced, but other pairs can be counted either way and our estimation guarantee is with respect to a threshold of $(1-\nu)T$.

When discretizing to νT, we obtain a worst-case guarantee of $1/\nu$ on the number of updates of $\delta[v,i]$ in each node-instance pair. In total, we obtain the claimed worst-case bound on the running time. □

B. OPTIMAL ORACLE ESTIMATOR

We show that the distance-based influence estimator presented in Algorithm 4 is an instance of the L* estimator of [13].

We first explain the derivation of the estimator. Similarly to the single node, this is a sum estimator applied to each summand (v,i) in Equation (7) to obtain an unbiased estimate of $\alpha(\min_{u\in S} d_{uv}^{(i)})$. Rank values r that belong to pairs (v,i) where $v \in S$ can be identified because they must appear as $(r,0)$ in cADS(v) when we use structured permutation ranks. For these pairs, we do not compute an estimate but simply add an exact contribution of $|S|\alpha(0)$ to the estimated influence.

The remaining rank values are those associated with pairs that have a positive distance from S. That is, a pair (v,i) so that $d_{Sv}^{(i)} > 0$. We would like to estimate $\alpha(\min_{u\in S} d_{uv}^{(i)})$ for each such pair (v,i). We apply the L* estimator of Cohen [13], which is applicable to any monotone estimation problem (MEP) and is the unique admissible (nonnegative unbiased) monotone estimator. We first show that our estimation problem is a MEP. To represent the problem as a MEP, we fix the rank values of all pairs, and consider the outcome (presence in cADS(u) for $u \in S$) as a function of the "random seed" $r_v^{(i)}$. Clearly, the lower $r_v^{(i)}$ is, the more information we have (a tighter upper bound) on $\alpha(d_{Sv}^{(i)})$. Therefore, the problem is a MEP.

The information in the outcome is actually contained in the skyline $\mathsf{skylines}[r_v^{(i)}]$ derived from the set of occurrences of the rank $r_v^{(i)}$ in the sketches of S. When the skyline for a pair (v,i) is empty ($r_v^{(i)}$ is not included in any of the sketches of nodes in S), the L* estimate is 0 and is not explicitly computed.

Note that the estimator is applied to each rank value $r_v^{(i)} \notin Z$ (and does not require explicit knowledge of the corresponding pair (v,i)).

Since the L* estimator is admissible, it dominates the union estimator and in particular has CV at most $1/\sqrt{2(k-1)}$. Note that this is an upper bound on the CV; the worst case is $|S|=1$ or when sketches are very similar. As with reachability sketches, we can expect the estimate quality to be up to a factor of $\sqrt{|S|}$ smaller when the "coverage" of different seed nodes are sufficiently different. Similarly, Chernoff concentration bounds apply here: If we use $k = \varepsilon^{-2}c\ln n$, the relative error exceeds ε with probability $\leq 1/n^c$. Therefore, with high probability, we can be accurate on polynomially many queries.

C. RUNNING TIME OF α-SKIM

This section provides the proof of Theorem 5.2. We also provide a slightly tighter worst-case bound on the (expected) running time for (i) the important cases of polynomial or exponential decay (both are instances of α with nonpositive relative rate of change) and (ii) general decay functions when we consider approximation with respect to relaxed influence computed with slight perturbations in distances:

THEOREM C.1. *A modified Algorithm* α-SKIM *runs in expected time*

$$O(\frac{\log^2 n}{\varepsilon}\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}|E^{(i)}|+\frac{\log^2 n}{\varepsilon^3}n+\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon^2}|\bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell}E^{(i)}|)=O(\varepsilon^{-3}\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}|E^{(i)}|\log^2 n)$$

providing the guarantee (14) *when* $(\ln\alpha(x))'\leq 0$ *(α has nonpositive relative rate of change). For a general decay function α, we obtain with high probability approximation with respect to* $\max_{U||U|=s}\tilde{\mathsf{Inf}}(\mathscr{G},U)$, *where* $\tilde{\mathsf{Inf}}(\mathscr{G},S)\equiv\sum_{u\in V}\alpha((1+\varepsilon)d_{Su})$.

We first list the main components of the α-SKIM computation, the bounds we obtain on the computation of each component, and pointers to the proofs in the sequel. The analysis assumes that $\lambda=0.5$.

- The reversed Dijkstra runs when building the sketches, including updating the sample and estimation data structures as new entries are inserted. Since we use efficient structures to identify which runs need to be resumed and to update estimates and samples, this component is dominated by the Dijkstra computations. We obtain a bound of $O(k\log^2 n\sum_v\max_{i\in[\ell]}deg^{(i)}(v))$ on the number of operations (see Lemma C.5).
- The forward Dijkstra runs which update the residual problem after a seed node is selected. We express the bound in terms of the maximum number of times, which we denote by X, that $\delta_v^{(i)}$ is decreased for a pair (i,v). We consider both bounding X and its impact on the time bound In Section C.3. We show that the forward Dijkstra runs take $O(X\sum_{i\in[\ell]}|E^{(i)}|\log n)$ operations (see Lemma C.6). We obtain a bound of $X=O(\varepsilon^{-1}\log^2 n)$ using Theorem 2.1. We also obtain a slightly tighter bound of $X=O(\varepsilon^{-1}\log n)$ for a slightly modified algorithm. The modified algorithm has the same approximation guarantee (as in Theorem 5.1) when α has nonpositive relative rate of change. For general α, the guarantee is with respect to a relaxed condition. In practice on realistic inputs, however, we expect X to be small and we observed good running times even without the modifications.
- Updating the sample and estimation structures when entries are reclassified down. This happens after a seed is added when the forward Dijkstra run from the seed in instance i updates $\delta_v^{(i)}$. This means all samples which include a (v,i) entry need to be updated. Expressed in terms of X, this cost is $O(Xnk\log n)$ (see Lemma C.7).
- Updating the sampling and estimation structures when entries are reclassified up. This can happen after τ is decreased. We obtain a bound of $O(nk\log^2 n)$ (in Section C.1).

C.1 The threshold τ

An immediate upper bound on the maximum influence of a node is $n\alpha(0)$. This means that we can safely initialize our algorithm with $\tau=(n\alpha(0)\ell)/k$ and have an expected initial sample sizes $O(k)$ for each node.

We next observe that we can safely terminate the algorithm when τ decreases to below $\tau\leq\varepsilon\alpha(0)\ell/k$ and incur at most $O(\varepsilon)$ contribution to the error. To establish that, first observe that the threshold τ is decreased only when the maximum estimated marginal influence, over all nodes, is less than τk. Therefore, when $\tau\leq\varepsilon\alpha(0)\ell/k$l, the maximum marginal influence of all nodes is at most $\varepsilon\alpha(0)$. Now observe that at this point, for all $s'\geq 0$, if we add s' additional seed nodes, the relative contribution of these nodes is at most $\leq(s'\varepsilon\alpha(0)/((s+s')\alpha(0))\leq\varepsilon$ (The denominator $(s+s')\alpha(0)$ is a lower bound on the total influence of any seed set of size $s+s'$).

Combining the start and end values of τ, we obtain the following bound on the total number of times τ is decreased:

LEMMA C.1. *τ can decrease at most* $\log_{1/\lambda}(n/\varepsilon)=O(\log n)$ *times.*

When τ decreases, we have the property that the PPS samples of all nodes are of size smaller than k (otherwise we have an estimate that exceeds $k\tau$).

After τ is decreased, we extend the samples to be with respect to the new τ. We show that the expected sample size remains $O(k)$:

LEMMA C.2. *For every node, the expected number of entries after a threshold decrease $\tau\leftarrow\lambda\tau$ is at most k/λ, with good concentration.*

PROOF. Equivalently, we consider the size of a PPS sample with threshold $\lambda\tau$ when the total weight of the set is at most $k\tau$. □

We are now ready to bound the total number of reclassification of sample entries.

LEMMA C.3. *The total number of reclassifications of entries in the sample is $O(nk\log n)$*

PROOF. An entry in $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$ can only be reclassified down 3 times before it is removed from the sample (from H to M, M to L, or L to removal), unless it is reclassified up. An entry can be reclassified up only when τ decreases, which happens at most $O(\log n)$ times. Each decrease "resets" at most kn entries to class H: Either existing entries reclassified up or at most new entries (since by Lemma C.2 expected sample sizes remain $O(k)$). These entries can then be reclassified down at most 3 times before they are eliminated from the sample. So the total number is $O(nk\log n)$. □

We are now ready to bound the total work performed by updating the sample and estimation components by entries being reclassified up as a result of a τ decrease (`MoveUp` calls). The cost of each such call is proportional to the number of reclassified entries. It also requires a call to the priority queue to efficiently find all inverted samples with at least one reclassified element. In the worst case, the cost is $O(\log(n\ell)=O(\log n)$ times the number of reclassifications. In total using Lemma C.3, we obtain a worst case bound of $O(nk\log^2 n)$ on the reclassification-up component of the computation.

C.2 Bounding the reversed Dijkstra computations

We bound the expected total number of distinct entries (pairs (v,i)) that were included in the PPS sample of a node u at any point during the execution of the algorithm.

LEMMA C.4. *For a node v, the number of distinct entries in the sample of v during the execution of the algorithm is $O(k\log n)$ with good concentration (of the upper bound).*

PROOF. Each decrease of τ introduces in expectation $O(k)$ new entries, and there are $O(\log n)$ such decreases (Lemma C.1). □

We can now bound the work of the reverse Dijkstra runs used to construct the sketches

LEMMA C.5. *The number of operations performed by the reverse Dijkstra runs is* $O(k\log^2 n\sum_v \max_{i\in[\ell]} deg^{(i)}(v))$

PROOF. Each productive scan of a node u by a reverse Dijkstra sourced at (v,i) (productive means that the node was next on the Dijkstra state priority queue) means that the entry (v,i) is inserted into a PPS sample of u, updating the estimation structure accordingly. This involves $O(\log n)$ operations in updating priority queues in the state of the Dijkstra run, structures maintaining the samples, and looking at all outgoing edges of the node in the transposed instance $G^{(i)}$.

Each such scan can be charged to an entry inserted into a PPS sample. From Lemma C.4, we obtain that each node, in expectation, can have $O(k\log n)$ such entries. Therefore, the node is scanned $O(k\log n)$ times. □

We remark that if the instances are generated by an IC model, we can replace $\max_{i\in[\ell]} deg^{(i)}(v)$ by the expected degree $\mathsf{E}[deg(v)]$ and accordingly obtain the bound $O(k\log^2 n\mathsf{E}[|E|])$.

C.3 Bounding the expected number of times $\delta_v^{(i)}$ decreases for a certain pair (v,i)

We now bound the n umber of updates of $\delta_v^{(i)}$ performed as seed are added when maintaining the residual problem.

If we have a bound of X on the number of updates per node-instance pair, then

LEMMA C.6. *The computation of the forward Dijkstra runs is* $O(X\sum_{i\in[\ell]}|E^{(i)}|\log n)$.

PROOF. Each node-instance scan can be charged to a decrease of $\delta_v^{(i)}$. □

We also can express the total cost of the `MoveDown()` calls by X.

LEMMA C.7. *The total computation of all* `MoveDown` *calls is*

$$O(Xnk\log n)\ .$$

PROOF. Each call to `MoveDown` for (v,i) updates a value for (v,i) in a priority queue (at $O(\log n)$ cost), which is of the order of the forward Dijkstra computation that generated the update of $\delta_v^{(i)}$. Otherwise, the `MoveDown` call performs a number of operations that is linear in the number of active entries in $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$ (entries that are in a sample of some node). In addition, `MoveDown` may also permanently discard entries at the tail of the $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$, but the removal of these entries is charged to their insertion.

It remains to bound the computation of `MoveDown` when processing active entries of $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$. Using Lemma C.4, there is a total of $O(nk\log n)$ entries that were active in a sample at any point during the execution. Each such entry can be affected at most X times. □

We now bound X. As argued in Section 3, we expect $X=O(\log n)$ on realistic instances. Now noting that our sampled-based greedy selection satisfies the condition of Theorem 2.1, we obtain a bound of $X=O(\varepsilon^{-2}\log^2 n)$.

Here we propose modifications of the algorithm that allow us to obtain a slightly tighter bound on X in interesting cases. The first case covers all smooth decay functions that are exponential or slower:

LEMMA C.8. *We can modify* α-SKIM *so that when* $\alpha(x)$ *has a nonpositive relative rate of change, that is,* $(\ln\alpha(x))'\geq 0$*, then*

$$X=O(\varepsilon^{-1}\log n)\ .$$

The modification preserves the approximation ratio stated in Theorem 5.1.

PROOF. The requirement $(\ln\alpha(x))'\geq 0$ implies that for all $x\geq 0$, $d\geq 0$, and $\Delta\geq 0$,

$$\frac{\alpha(d-\Delta)-\alpha(d)}{\alpha(d)}\geq\frac{\alpha(x+d-\Delta)-\alpha(d)}{\alpha(x+d)}\ .$$

This means that when we apply the following prune rules on forward updates of $\delta_v^{(i)}$: We prune at nodes where

$$\frac{\alpha(d-\Delta)-\alpha(d)}{\alpha(d)}\leq\varepsilon\ , \tag{17}$$

where d is the current value of $\delta_v^{(i)}$ and $d-\Delta$ is the updated value, the condition (17) would actually hold for all nodes in instance i reachable from v via the Dijkstra search (since all these nodes have larger $\delta_v^{(i)}$.

The prune condition implies that for (v,i) and all nodes Dijkstra would have reached from the pruned one, the updated influence contribution by the better (closer) coverage is at most ε times the previous value. So with this pruning, the influence of the seed set is captured with relative error of at most ε.

We also observe that we can also always prune the Dijkstra computations when the distance satisfies $\alpha(d)\leq\alpha(0)/n^2\leq\varepsilon\alpha(0)/n$.

Combining, it means that with the prune rules, the total number of updates of $\delta_v^{(i)}$ per node-instance pair is $O(\varepsilon^{-1}\log n)$. □

LEMMA C.9. *We can modify the algorithm so that for any general decay function* α*,* $X=O(\varepsilon^{-1}\log n)$*. With the modification, we obtain that with high probability,*

$$\mathsf{Inf}(\mathscr{G},S)\geq(1-(1-1/s)^s-\varepsilon)\max_{U||U|=|S|}\tilde{\mathsf{Inf}}(\mathscr{G},U)\ ,$$

where $\tilde{\mathsf{Inf}}(\mathscr{G},S)\equiv\sum_{u\in V}\alpha((1+\varepsilon)d_{Su})$.

PROOF. We can apply a similar prune rule in the forward Dijkstra runs which updates only when the decrease to distance is at least ε times the current distance. This would give us a bound on the number of updates, but a weaker approximation guarantee that holds with respect to a softened influence function $\sum_{u\in V}\alpha((1+\varepsilon)d_{Su})$. □

D. PSEUDOCODE

D.1 Functions for Distance-Based GREEDY

This appendix contains the pseudocode of functions for our distance-based version of GREEDY from Section 2.

Function MargGain(u): Marginal influence of u

Input: Residual instance $(\mathscr{G},\delta)$ and node u
Output: $\mathsf{Inf}((\mathscr{G},\delta),u)$
$I_u\leftarrow 0$; `// sum of marginal contributions`
foreach *instance* i **do**
  Run Dijkstra from u in $G^{(i)}$, during which
  foreach *visited node* v *at distance* d **do**
    if $\alpha(d)=0$ *or* $d\geq\delta[v,i]$ **then** Prune**else**
    $I_u\stackrel{+}{\leftarrow}\alpha(d)-\alpha(\delta[v,i])$
return I_u/ℓ

Function AddSeed(u): Update δ according to u

Input: Residual instance $(\mathscr{G}, \delta)$ and node u
foreach *instance* i **do**
  Run Dijkstra from u in $G^{(i)}$, during which
  foreach *visited node* v *at distance* d **do**
    if $\alpha(d) = 0$ *or* $d \geq \delta[v,i]$ **then** Prune**else** $\delta[v,i] \leftarrow d$

D.2 Algorithms for Threshold Model

This appendix contains the pseudocode of algorithms for threshold influence maximization (Section 3)

Algorithm 3: Threshold IM (T-SKIM)

Input: Directed graphs $\{G^{(i)}\}$, threshold T, parameter k
Output: Sequence of node and marginal influence pairs

```
// Initialization
```
forall the *node/instance pairs* (u,i) **do** $\delta[u,i] \leftarrow \infty$ **forall the** *nodes* v **do** size$[v] \leftarrow 0$ index $\leftarrow$ hash map of node-instance pairs to nodes
seedlist $\leftarrow \perp$ `// List of seeds & marg. influences`
rank $\leftarrow 0$

shuffle the $n\ell$ node-instance pairs (u,i)

```
// Compute seed nodes
```
while |seedlist| $< n$ **do**
  while rank $< n\ell$ **do** `// Build sketches`
    rank $\leftarrow$ rank $+ 1$
    $(u,i) \leftarrow$ rank-th pair in shuffled sequence
    if $\delta[u,i] < \infty$ **then skip**; `// Pair (u,i) is covered`
    run Dijkstra from u in reverse graph $G^{(i)}$, during which
    foreach *scanned node* v *in distance* d **do**
      if $d > T$ **then prune**; `// Prune at depth T`
      size$[v] \leftarrow$ size$[v] + 1$
      index$[u,i] \leftarrow$ index$[u,i] \cup \{v\}$
      if size$[v] = k$ **then**
        $x \leftarrow v$ `// Next seed node`
        abort sketch building
  if *all nodes* u *have* size$[u] < k$ **then**
    $x \leftarrow \text{argmax}_{u \in V}$ size$[u]$
  $I_x \leftarrow 0$ `// The coverage of x`
  forall the *instances* i **do** `// Residual problem`
    run Dijkstra from x in forward graph $G^{(i)}$, during which
    foreach *scanned node* v *in distance* d **do**
      if $\delta[v,i] \leq d$ **or** $d > T$ **then prune if** $\delta[v,i] = \infty$ **then** $I_x \leftarrow I_x + 1$ $\delta[v,i] \leftarrow d$
      forall the *nodes* w *in* index$[v,i]$ **do**
        size$[w] \leftarrow$ size$[w] - 1$
      index$[v,i] \leftarrow \perp$ `// Erase (v,i) from index`
  seedlist.append(x, I_x/ℓ)
return seedlist

D.3 Algorithms for Distance-Based Influence Oracle

This appendix contains the pseudocode for our distance-based influence oracle (Section 4).

Algorithm 4: Distance-Based Influence Oracle

Input: Seed set S, function α, sketches cADS(u) for $u \in S$
Output: Estimated influence for S

```
// Remember ranks who have distance zero in at
   least one sketch with respect to S
```
Z $\leftarrow$ empty set (e.g. hash map) of ranks
forall the *nodes* $u \in S$ **do**
  foreach *entry* $(r,d) \in$ cADS(u) *with* $d = 0$ **do**
    Z.insert(r)

```
// Build for each appearing rank a set of
   threshold rank/influence pairs
```
skylines $\leftarrow$ new hash map from rank to array of pairs
forall the *nodes* $u \in S$ **do**
  Q $\leftarrow$ new max-heap of k smallest rank values
  foreach *entry* $(r,d) \in$ cADS(u) **do**
    if |Q| $< k$ **then**
      if $r \notin$ Z **then** skylines$[r]$.append($(1.0, \alpha(d))$)
      Q.insert(r)
    else
      if $r \notin$ Z **then**
        skylines$[r]$.append((Q.max_element(), $\alpha(d)$))
      Q.insert(r)
      Q.delete_max(r)

```
// Eliminate dominated entries
```
forall the *ranks* $r \in$ skylines **do**
  `// Sort by threshold rank in decreasing order. Break ties by decreasing α`
  sort(skylines$[r]$)
  $\alpha^* \leftarrow 0$
  forall the *thresh. rank/infl. pairs* $(\tau, \alpha) \in$ skylines$[r]$ **do**
    if $\alpha < \alpha^*$ **then** skylines$[r]$.erase((τ, α)) **else**
    $\alpha^* \leftarrow \alpha$

```
// This calls the L* estimator for each skyline
```
return $|S| \cdot \alpha(0) + (1/\ell) \cdot \sum_{r \in \text{skylines}}$ L*(skylines$[r]$)

Algorithm 5: L*estimator applied to a sorted skyline

Input: A sorted skyline skylines$[r] = \{(\tau_j, \alpha_j)\}$
Output: L*(skylines$[r]$)

$S \leftarrow 0$; $x \leftarrow 0$
for $i = 1, \ldots, |\text{skylines}[r]|$ **do**
    $x \leftarrow (\alpha_i - S)/\tau_i$ `// Note that x is overwritten`
    if $i < |\text{skylines}[r]|$ **then** $S \leftarrow S + x \cdot (\tau_i - \tau_{i+1})$
return x

Algorithm 6: Combine rank-distance lists

Input: Two rank-distance lists A_1 and A_2
Output: Combined all-distance sketch ADS$_c$

ADS$_c \leftarrow$ new (empty) ADS
`// Merge sketches by increasing distance,`
`   breaking ties by increasing rank`
tempsketch $\leftarrow$ `merge(`A_1, A_2`)`

numzero $\leftarrow 0$
Q $\leftarrow$ new max-heap of k smallest rank values

`// Handle entries with distance 0`
foreach *entry* $(r,d) \in$ tempsketch *with* $d = 0$ **do**
    if numzero $< k$ **then** ADS$_c(u)$`.append((`r,d`))`
    Q`.insert(`r`)`
    if $|\text{Q}| > k$ **then** Q`.delete_max()`
    numzero $\leftarrow$ numzero $+ 1$

`// Handle the rest of the entries`
foreach *entry* $(r,d) \in$ tempsketch *with* $d > 0$ **do**
    if $|\text{Q}| < k$ *or* $r <$ Q`.max_element()` **then**
        ADS$_c(u)$`.append((`r,d`))`
        Q`.insert(`r`)`
        if $|\text{Q}| > k$ **then** Q`.delete_max()`

return ADS$_c$

D.4 Functions for α-SKIM

This appendix contains the subroutines of Algorithm 2 (α-SKIM), our fast algorithm for distance-based influence maximization.

Function NextSeed

Output: The node u which maximizes $\mathsf{Est}.H[u] + \tau\mathsf{Est}.M[u]$, if happy with estimate. Otherwise $\perp$.

while true do
- **if** *max priority in* Qcands $< k\tau$ **then return** $\perp$ **else**
  - Remove maximum priority u from Qcands;
  - $\hat{I}_u \leftarrow \mathsf{Est}.H[u] + \tau\mathsf{Est}.M[u]$;
  - **if** $\hat{I}_u \geq k\tau$ *and* $\hat{I}_u \geq$ max *in* Qcands **then**
    - $I_u \leftarrow$ `MargGain(`u`)`;
    - **if** $I_u \geq (1 - 1/\sqrt{k})\hat{I}_u$ **then return** $(u, \hat{I}_u)$**else**
      - Place u with priority I_u in Qcands;
      - **return** $\perp$
  - **else**
    - Place u with priority $\hat{I}_u$ in Qcands

Function MoveUp Update estimates after decrreasing τ

foreach (v,i) *in* Qhml *with priority* $\geq \tau$ **do**
- delete (v,i) from Qhml
- `// Process index[`v,i`]`
- **if** $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] \neq \perp$ **then** `// move entries from M/L to H`
  - **while** $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] < |\mathsf{index}[v,i]|$ *and* $(u,d) \leftarrow \mathsf{index}[v,i][\mathsf{HM}[v,i]]$ *satisfies* $(c \leftarrow \alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta_v^{(i)})) \geq \tau$ **do**
    - $\mathsf{Est}.H[u] \stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} c$
    - **if** $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] = \perp$ *or* $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] > \mathsf{HM}[v,i]$ **then**
      - `// Entry was M`
      - $\mathsf{Est}.M[u] \stackrel{-}{\leftarrow} 1$
    - $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] \stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} 1$
  - **if** $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] \neq \perp$ *and* $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] < \mathsf{HM}[v,i]$ **then**
    - $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] \leftarrow \mathsf{HM}[v,i]$
  - **if** $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] \geq |\mathsf{index}[v,i]|$ **then**
    - $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] \leftarrow \perp$; $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] \leftarrow \perp$
- **if** $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] \neq \perp$ **then** `// Move from L to M`
  - **while** $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] < |\mathsf{index}[v,i]|$ *and* $(u,d) \leftarrow \mathsf{index}[v,i][\mathsf{ML}[v,i]]$ *satisfies* $\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta_v^{(i)}) \geq r_v^{(i)}\tau$ **do**
    - $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] \stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} 1$; $\mathsf{Est}.M[u] \stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} 1$
  - **if** $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] \geq |\mathsf{index}[v,i]|$ **then** $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] \leftarrow \perp$
- `UpdateReclassThresh(`v,i`)` `// update Qhml`

Function UpdateReclassThresh(v,i)

Output: Update priority of (v,i) in Qhml

$c \leftarrow 0$;

if $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] \neq \perp$ **then**
- $(u,d) \leftarrow \mathsf{index}[v,i][\mathsf{HM}[v,i]]$; $c \leftarrow \alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta_v^{(i)})$

if $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] \neq \perp$ **then**
- $(u,d) \leftarrow \mathsf{index}[v,i][\mathsf{ML}[v,i]]$;
- $c \leftarrow \max\{c, (\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta_v^{(i)}))/r_v^{(i)}\}$

if $c > 0$ **then**
- update priority of (v,i) in Qhml to c

Function MoveDown $((v,i), \delta_0, \delta_t)$

Output: Update estimation components for (v,i) when $\delta_v^{(i)}$ decreases from δ_0 to δ_t

$j \leftarrow 0$; $t \leftarrow \perp$; $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] \leftarrow \perp$;

$z \leftarrow |\mathsf{index}[v,i]| - 1$; **if** $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] \neq \perp$ **then** $z \leftarrow \mathsf{ML}[v,i]$

$\mathsf{ML}[v,i] \leftarrow \perp$

while $j \leq z$ **do**
- $(u,d) \leftarrow \mathsf{index}[v,i][j]$;
- **if** $\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta_0) \geq \tau$ **then** `// entry was H`
  - $\mathsf{Est}.H[u] \stackrel{-}{\leftarrow} \alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta_0)$;
  - **if** $\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta_t) \geq \tau$ **then** `// is H`
    - $\mathsf{Est}.H[u] \stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} \alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta_t)$
  - **else if** $\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta_t) \geq r_v^{(i)}\tau$ **then** `// is M`
    - $\mathsf{Est}.M[u] \stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} 1$; **if** $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] = \perp$ **then** $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] = j$
  - **else if** $\alpha(d) \leq \alpha(\delta_t)$ **then** `// truncate`
    - **if** $t = \perp$ **then** $t = j$
  - **else** `// is L`
    - **if** $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] = \perp$ **then** $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] \leftarrow j$
- **else if** $\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta_0) \geq r_v^{(i)}\tau$ **then** `// entry was M`
  - **if** $\alpha(d) - \alpha(\delta_t) \geq r_v^{(i)}\tau$ **then** `// is M`
    - **if** $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] = \perp$ **then** $\mathsf{HM}[v,i] \leftarrow j$
  - **else** `// is not M`
    - $\mathsf{Est}.M[u] \stackrel{-}{\leftarrow} 1$;
    - **if** $\alpha(d) \leq \alpha(\delta_t)$ **then** `// truncate`
      - **if** $t = \perp$ **then** $t = j$
    - **else** `// is L`
      - **if** $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] = \perp$ **then** $\mathsf{ML}[v,i] \leftarrow j$
- $j \stackrel{+}{\leftarrow} 1$

if $t \neq \perp$ **then** truncate $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$ from t on. **else** `// clean tail`
- $t \leftarrow |\mathsf{index}[v,i]| - 1$;
- **while** $t \geq 0$ *and* $(u,d) \leftarrow \mathsf{index}[v,i][t]$ *has* $\alpha(d) \leq \alpha(\delta_t)$ **do**
  - $t \stackrel{-}{\leftarrow} 1$
- truncate $\mathsf{index}[v,i]$ at position $t+1$ on

Remove pair (v,i) from Qhml

`UpdateReclassThresh(`v,i`)` `// Update Qhml`